DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 258 CE 001 811

AUTHOR	Gibbons, Christina
TITLE	The Role of the Counselor in Public Service Employment: The Vermont Experience. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Vermont State Employment Service, Montpelier. Dept. of Employment Security.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
REPORT NO	DLMA-82-48-70-30-9-FR
PUB DATE	Sep 73
NOTE	74p.; For related documents, see CE 001 805-818
AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; Counseling; Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Acceptance; Counselor Functions; *Counselor Role; *Employment Programs; Handicapped; Low Income Groups; Motivation; Pilot Projects; Public Service Occupations; Rehabilitation; *Rehabilitation Counseling; Social Welfare; Vocational Adjustment; Work Attitudes; Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS	Manpower Research; *Vermont

ABSTRACT

The ensuing report is a counselor's first hand account of her experience with Vermont's Manpower Pilot Project on Public Service Employment. This statewide project was designed to test temporary subsidized employment in nonprofit agencies for low income clients. The report describes and refers to many case studies, specifically those who entered the program because they were liable for the support of children and also had no or low income. Although the program originally was committed toward helping "hard-core unemployables," emphasis was shifted to those who evidenced fewer, less severe barriers to employment. Clients were placed in subsidized employment for 6 months, with the exceptation that their work experience would lead to permanent, nonsubsidized employment. The counselor devoted her energies to help the client overcome his major barriers to employment, such as: transportation, child care, and job attitude. (Also included are 11 appendixes and a two-item bibliography.) (Author)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 094253

THE ROLE OF THE COUNSELOR

IN

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT:

THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE

Vermont Department of Employment Security

Madelyn Davidson, Commissioner

The Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project on the Special Work Project for the Unemployed and Upgrading for the Working Poor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 001 811

September 1973

THE ROLE OF THE COUNSELOR IN PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT: THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development contract No. 82-48-70-30. Since contractors conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgement freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The contractor is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

Contract No. 82-48-70-30 funded the Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project on the Special Work Project for the Unemployed and Upgrading for the Working Poor. This Project was conducted by the Vermont Department of Employment Security, Madelyn Davidson, Commissioner. The principal author of this monograph is Christina Gibbons of the Department of Employment Security, State of Vermont.

September, 1973

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. DLMA 82-48-70-30-9	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.

4. Title and Subtitle
THE ROLE OF THE COUNSELOR IN PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT: THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE

5. Report Date: Sep. 73

6.

7. Author(s)
Christina Gibbons, Vermont Department of Employment Security

8. Performing Organization Rept. No.

9. Performing Organization Name and Address
Vermont Department of Employment Security
Box 488, Green Mountain Drive
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.

11. Contract/Grant No.
DL 82-48-70-30

12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address
U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration
Office of Research and Development
1111 20th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210

13. Type of Report & Period Covered 11/1/70 - Final: 6/30/73

14.

15. Supplementary Notes: Prepared as part of the Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project conducted by the Vermont Department of Employment Security.

16. Abstracts: The ensuing report is a Counselor's first hand account of her experience with Vermont's Manpower Pilot Project on Public Service Employment. This statewide project was designed to test temporary subsidized employment in nonprofit agencies for low income clients. The report describes and refers to many case studies, specifically those who entered the program because they were liable for the support of children and also had no or low income. Although the program originally was committed toward helping "hard-core unemployables", emphasis was shifted to those who evidenced fewer, less severe barriers to employment. Clients were placed in subsidized employment for six months, with the expectation that their work experience would lead to permanent, non-subsidized employment. The counselor devoted her energies to aid the client overcome his major barriers to employment, such as: transportation, child care and job attitude.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors
Adjustment (psychology)
Counseling
Employment
Handicapped workers
Motivation
Placement
Rehabilitation

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

17c. COSATI Field/Group: 5I, 5J, 5K

18. Availability Statement	19. Security Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151.	UNCLASSIFIED	83
	20. Security Class (This Page)	22. Price
		$3.00

PREFACE

In mid-1970, as a consequence of welfare reform legislation then pending in the United States Congress, the Vermont Department of Employment Security was chosen to test and document experimentation in the manpower training aspects of the proposed legislation. The overall objective of the resulting Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) Manpower Pilot Project was to explore the feasibility and value of alternative approaches and procedures for conducting the Special Work Project (Public Service Employment) for the unemployed and Upgrading training for the working poor, as a means of helping to develop guidelines and other knowledge required to facilitate and make more effective national implementation and rapid expansion of manpower projects aimed at enhancing the employability of heads (and other members) of low-income families.

The project thus had two major components within the overall project:

- "Special Work Project" whereby unemployed persons, by performing work (at public and private nonprofit agencies in the public interest) can develop job skills which enable them to obtain nonsubsidized (private or public) employment,

- "Upgrading training" whereby low-income employed persons ("working poor") can develop new job skills for which they receive increased salary.

More specifically the project:

- developed various designs for operating the two manpower programs,

- tested operating practices to identify smooth running procedures,

- tested the feasibility and relative effectiveness of alternative operating procedures,

-identified problems and issues central to the establishment and running of these programs,

-prepared technical materials and other aids for use in the programs,

-monitored and evaluated outcomes of activities,

-determined requirements for administration, facilities, staff and financing of the programs,

-established guides for determining how these programs might fit into the overall mixture of manpower programs and services at the local level,

-developed the necessary guidelines and manuals for effectively replicating the programs elsewhere,

-researched and documented the effect of the program on E&D manpower clients and,

-produced monographs on salient aspects of project experience, relevant to planning activities at the national level for implementation of welfare reform and/or public service employment programs.

The project was initiated on July 1, 1970, and terminated on October 31, 1973. Operation of the project was divided into the following segments:

July 1, 1970, through October 31, 1970: Planning, initiation, and startup,

November 1, 1970, through June 30, 1971: Operations limited to Chittenden and Lamoille counties,

July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972: Statewide operations,

July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973: Statewide operations,

July 1, 1973, through October 31, 1973: Evaluation, writing, printing and publishing.

FINAL TRAINEE SUMMARY — SPECIAL WORK

As of July 2, 1973	Number	Number	Number	Percentage of Total Enrollees
Total Special Work Enrollments		656		100%
Completed Training		430		65.6%
-Completed, Placed in Employment	307			46.8%
-Completed, Placed in Work Training	26			4.0%
Total Placements			333	50.8%
-Completed, Placed in Education or Skill Training	6			0.9%
-Completed, Awaiting Placement	91			13.9%
Terminated Training		226		34.4%
-Good Cause	99			15.1%
-Without Good Cause	127			19.3%

FINAL TRAINEE SUMMARY — UPGRADING

As of July 2, 1973	Number	Number	Percentage of Total Enrollees
Total Upgrading Enrollments		144	100%
-Completed Training		118	81.9%
Upgraded	114		79.2%
Not Upgraded	4		2.8%
-Terminated Training		26	18.0%
Good Cause	17		11.8%
Without Good Cause	9		6.2%

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	vii
Section I: Introduction	1
Section II: Case Histories	5
A. Jack H.	5
B. Ronald K.	12
C. Jan P.	15
D. Alice D.	18
Section III: Analysis	21
A. Some Characteristics of the E&D Program and Its Participants	21
B. Selection of Employers	24
C. Service Needs	26
D. Service Resources	28
E. Service Delivery	31
F. Counselor-Client Relationships	34
G. Counselor and Colleagues	38
H. Follow-Up, Termination and Follow-Through	40
Section IV: Recommendations for Public Service Employment Programs	43
Appendixes	
Appendix A: E&D Eligibility Guidelines	47
Appendix B: VSES-400: Resume of Applicant History	51
Appendix C: VSES Counseling Record	56
Appendix D: FAP-VR Support Services Referral and Service Report	60
Appendix E: Aptitudes Measured by the GATB	61
Appendix F: Request for Approval of Enrichment Training	62
Appendix G: Request for Approval of Training Related Expenses	64
Appendix H: Child Care Information & Referral Form	66
Appendix I: Request for Welfare Service	67
Appendix J: In-Training Follow-Up for Special Work Enrollees	68
Appendix K: Post-Training Follow-Through for SWP Clients	69
Bibliography	71

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this monograph is to describe the tasks and issues facing employment Counselors who participated in the Vermont Department of Employment Security (DES) Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) Manpower Pilot Project in Public Service Employment in Vermont. It is written by one of the Counselors, using testimony from four others throughout the state. Based on their experiences, the report draws some conclusions and makes some recommendations for future Public Service Employment programs.

The DES E&D Project was designed to test temporary subsidized employment in nonprofit agencies for low income clients. The project started operations in November 1970 in the Employment Service offices of Burlington and Morrisville. It was extended to the other offices of the State in July 1971 and was at that time "meshed" with the ongoing operations of the Work Incentive Program (WIN). Evaluation began early in the project but intensified in the summer of 1972 and continued along with operations until the end of the project in July 1973. Thus the length of Counselor involvement ranged from 1 1/2 to 2 1/2 years.

In testing temporary, subsidized employment (called then, and hereafter referred to as Special Work), planners hoped to

be able to answer a number of important questions:

1) What kinds of clients are best served by Special Work?
2) Could it be used as stopgap employment?
3) Could it provide skill training?
4) Could it help an inexperienced client get used to the "world of work"?
5) Was it useful as transitional employment to a permanent job?
6) Could it be used to evaluate a client's potential?
7) What services and supports would clients need during enrollment?
8) Would Special Work be a good solution to the employment problems of the "disadvantaged?"
9) Could it affect the general unemployment picture?
10) In short, was Special Work an effective tool for the Employment Service (ES) to adopt?

There are many ways to analyze the data gathered during the project and many ways to answer these questions. This monograph will attempt to answer them from the Counselor's point of view, reflecting the opinions and experiences of those who participated. Since counseling is a very personal process, it can best be understood in terms of individual examples. Therefore, as a focal point for the study, four case histories have been chosen to represent many facets of the Counselor's experience.

Two of the four cases were men, two women; two were Welfare dependent, the others not; only two succeeded in terms of the program, that is, they completed the subsidized period and remained employed for six months afterward. Three of the clients had health problems, two had transportation needs, two required childcare.

The histories are described as fully as the Counselor experienced them. They include explanations on source of referral, evaluation of client, selection of employer, service needs, and outcome of placement. They are in no way presented as models of counseling technique. Counselors make their share of mistakes and errors in judgment and for the purposes of this study, the errors may be as informative as the successes.

Following the four histories, there are eight sections which generalize about the process of counseling in the E&D program. These sections, which describe selection of participants and employers, service problems, and relationships among participants, will refer repeatedly to the histories and, in fact, cannot adequately be understood without knowledge of the histories. It is only with a combination of examples and generalizations that the functioning of the program can be understood and its effectiveness gauged.

At the end of the study, there are some brief recommend-

ations for Public Service Employment programs which, in the Counselors' experiences would make such programs more useful to the client and more effective for the Employment Service (ES).

This monograph is only one of a number of studies which examine the project in various aspects and with different viewpoints. For instance, some of the material here is also discussed in the monograph by the Coach, the paraprofessional member of the Employment Service staff. For a purely statistical analysis, one should turn to the Booz-Allen study[1], much of it based on the same client group discussed in this monograph.

Finally, there is one aspect of the E&D program which is not treated at all in this monograph, Upgrading. Upgrading refers to the effort to cooperate with employers in identifying and training those employees whose salaries are below poverty guidelines and who are therefore "working poor". Most E&D Counselors had little or no responsibility for the Upgrading effort. For an analysis of the project's experience with Upgrading, the reader may refer to "Final Upgrading Report of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project."[2]

---

[1]"Study of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Project," a report prepared by Booz-Allen Public Administration Services Inc., Washington, D. C. for the Vermont Department of Employment Security, September, 1973.

[2]Final Upgrading Report of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project, Vermont Department of Employment Security, September 1973.

SECTION II

CASE HISTORIES

A. Jack H.

The story of Jack H. is unusually thorough, partly because the counseling relationship lasted for almost two years and was very close, and partly because the people involved, the Social Worker and employer, were also very committed to the case. If closeness of all working relationships is an ideal in a program such as E&D, then this case came as close as any to that ideal. It is especially disappointing, although not surprising, that despite everyone's best efforts, the client did not complete his Special Work training and is at this time unemployed.

Jack H. was referred to the Counselor by his social service planner in the Department of Welfare in March 1971. The planner explained on the phone that the client was already enrolled in the Work Incentive Program (WIN), but that no progress had been made and that subsidized employment might answer his needs. She specifically mentioned that Jack was young (19 at the time), already married with one child, and inexperienced in the world of work. His problems were moderately severe hemophelia and a constellation of immature attitudes and behaviors caused in part by his failure to adjust to the disease.

Jack's disease usually manifested itself when he bumped or strained his joints, especially his knees and elbows. They would swell painfully, a symptom which could be lessened if he went to the hospital for medication when he first noticed it. Jack almost never remembered what might have caused an injury because he wasn't trying to be careful. Apparently his lower-middle class family had never adjusted to his disease and consequently allowed him tne life of a normal, active male. Jack liked to spend time with his cousins working on old cars, hunting, swimming, and snowmobiling. Every injury was an insult and a deep discouragement to him.

The planner admitted this to be a "tough case" but felt that Jack was "too young to give up on." In the early months of the program, it was E&D policy to accept WIN clients considered "hardcore" -- particularly difficult to work with. It was also policy at that time to try to accommodate everyone referred. So an appointment was made for Jack through the planner, and in the meantime, records were obtained from the WIN counselor.

The records consisted of a WIN referral (VSES 400) and a

recent psychological evaluation.[1] The referral gave basic information such as address, family size, health, Welfare grant ($321), education (ninth grade), and work experience. Jack had spent several summers helping an uncle deliver milk and had recently spent three months on an assembly line in a bottling plant. He had lost this job when he injured his knee at work.

The psychologist's report, seen in hindsight, was unusually accurate. It had been requested by the planner in hopes that it would give the employment Counselors something to work on, but it was not very encouraging. It stated that the client was of low average intelligence and displayed "poor judgement" in personal and vocational decisions. The prognosis was "poor" unless the client himself sought treatment to gain control over his impulses and acceptance of the implications of his disease.

Thus the E&D Counselor knew a lot about Jack before the first appointment. When he appeared he was pale and nervously loud-spoken, but he was surprisingly well-muscled and energetic. The interview covered areas listed in the Vermont State Employment Service counseling folder[2] such as work experience, education, health, and vocational interests. The Counselor learned that Jack had tried to attend Adult Basic Education under WIN, but hadn't felt comfortable because he was the only male in the class. He described some odd jobs he had held such as dishwashing and gas pumping and stated that he had never told an employer about his disability.

When asked what kinds of work he wanted, he listed four: mechanics, gun repair, cooking, teacher aide. All of these were based on his limited background: he owned and repaired a series of old cars and several rifles, he had worked in a kitchen, and he had helped with other handicapped children during a lengthy hospitalization at age 16.

The Counselor knew that a group of Special Work slots had already been written at a local high school kitchen for several assistant cooks and a baker. Jack said he might be interested in being assistant cook but not in baking because the smell of dough made him sick. The Counselor felt the need of more information about Jack's health before any real plans could be made and a subsequent call to the client's doctor revealed that Jack should "stay away from knives." The cooking idea, never very exciting to Jack, receded.

Following the first interview, a referral[3] (then required for all cases) was mailed to the local division of Vocational Rehabilitation, requesting their opinion of his physical and psychological ability to work. This was returned in only two weeks, because, as it turned out, Jack was already a VR client with a full work-up and record.

---

[1] See APPENDIX B.
[2] See APPENDIX C.
[3] See APPENDIX D.

The report said Jack should "limit walking, standing, stooping, kneeling, lifting, reaching, pushing, pulling, and avoid heavy labor." In addition, it noted Jack had a motivation problem because he was not "very responsive to VR efforts to contact or assist him." The Counselor was depressed by the list of restrictions but also concluded that the first task with Jack, before a realistic vocational plan could be made, was to win his cooperation.

At the next counseling session, the Counselor told Jack frankly that he should demonstrate his trustworthiness by keeping a weekly appointment. He agreed to this, demonstrating a positive characteristic -- he liked to please people and needed approval. He also agreed to take the General Aptitude Test Battery[1] in case it should reveal an unexpected aptitude.

The results of the test were a bit encouraging: although his "school" skills, arithmetic and especially reading, were well below average, his practical skills such as spatial relations, form perception, and finger dexterity were above average. Basically, he had above average intelligence, but school had been interrupted so often by his illness that his skills had developed poorly and left him discouraged and anxious. Despite long discussions, Jack resisted the idea of trying basic education again.

During this time the Counselor often consulted the service planner by phone regarding Jack's attitudes toward school and his disease. The planner had offered the client counseling service, but had been rejected. There would be no use in forcing him to go either. It takes considerable sophistication for a person to recognize his own need for psychological counseling and to make good use of it. Jack (as well as the majority of other E&D clients) simply did not have this sophistication.

In the appointments of the next several months, the Counselor discussed a number of vocations with Jack which might be both manly enough and safe enough to suit him. He rejected the idea of auto counterman, saying his spelling and figuring were not good enough; he was probably right. He was quite interested in gun repair. The Manpower Specialist contacted every repair shop in the area only to learn that no one's volume of business was sufficient for a helper. Similarly, there were no opportunities in watch repair, optical houses, electronic assembly, or inspection.[2]

In June, a local daycare center asked the E&D program

---

[1] See APPENDIX E.

[2] At this time, the program was writing subcontracts with a few profit-making businesses to upgrade their employees. Sometimes this worked in effect like on-the-job training. So the Staff was not limited to nonprofit organizations in seeking work for Jack.

to write a subcontract for a combination driver-custodian, a position declined by Jack because he thought the children would make him nervous (right again). During the summer, he got quite interested in radio repair and several joint meetings were held with his Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor. VR had funds available to send him to a Goodwill training facility in Massachusetts which specialized in benchwork for the handicapped.

Jack's first objection was leaving his wife and (by now two) children in a substandard apartment in a dingy section of town. His wife wanted to live in a particular public housing unit, located close to the Adult Basic Education, which she wished to attend. The service planner and Counselor met with the head of the Housing Authority, explaining the circumstances and gaining special consideration for the family. However, when the unit became available, Jack himself decided that he did not want public housing, and resented the manner in which it was offered, as a special favor. The wife finally located a fairly nice apartment through the newspaper.

But as the discussion of Massachusetts continued, Jack and his wife became anxious about their separation. Underneath everything, Jack was so afraid of failure that he resisted trying the school and the VR Counselor got less enthusiastic about sending him. By this time it was September, six months after Jack had been interviewed for E&D and the situation looked discouraging.

Then the Manpower Specialist announced that a second local high school wanted to subcontract for a delivery boy to drive pre-made lunches to other schools in the city. Jack liked this idea and the Counselor accompanied him to an interview with the head of the kitchen, an extremely fair and kind man. During the interview, the disease was discussed and ground rules were laid for coping with it. If Jack had an injury on or off the job, he should immediately go for a treatment and return to work as soon as he was comfortable again. The supervisor expected some absence, but hoped it could be kept to a minimum with prompt care.

The supervisor and Jack agreed to try each other out and a Special Work subcontract was written to reimburse 90% of the cost of employment for nine months. He started work September 13, working thirty hours a week for $2.20/hr.

The first month of employment was difficult. Jack missed several days due to a swollen knee and then contracted the flu. He was so discouraged that he stayed away from work two extra days even though he felt better. The Counselor learned this from Jack's wife and called a meeting with Jack and his supervisor. The supervisor handled the problem skillfully: he expressed disappointment that Jack should let him down and said he knew Jack could do better. To please his supervisor,

Jack made a great effort in the following months.

By December, reports of Jack's work were very good. He was punctual, cooperative, particularly polite to other staff members, and his absence had been minimal. He even stayed on the job through the three week deer season, which to many Vermonters is a sacred institution. He stated that he loved his job and hoped he could keep it through the summer. He also asked for and was given five more hours a week.

His welfare grant had dropped from $321 to $190 on November 1 after his earnings and needs had been calculated by a payments technician. This had caused him to be very anxious for he was not convinced of his ability to stay on the job. His service planner explained that any lengthy absence would make him eligible for an emergency increase in Welfare. His medical expenses and those of his family were still covered by Medicaid. The partial grant and Medicaid were available as long as Jack was a bona fide trainee. At this time, the Counselor and service planner did not worry Jack with the fact that if he succeeded and became a full-time employee of the school, he would lose these benefits. Privately, though, they thought that the only way the family could ever achieve independence would be for Jack's wife to contribute an income.

Jack himself was never a good money manager. He always wanted to keep his earnings for himself and, particularly, for his series of cars, despite repeated counsel from his planner. His wife, on the other hand, was an excellent budgeter. So money was a big source of friction between them, but there were others too. Jack wanted a son in addition to his two daughters but his wife was firmly opposed. She talked, instead, of going to Adult Basic Education and then clerical training and was, in fact, on the waiting list for the Work Incentive Program. Jack opposed this idea of her working and also refused to teach her to drive. In Jack's social milieu, it was common to expect a wife to be fully dependent on her husband. Jack would not see that his handicap required modification of this standard, even though his wife herself desired to help.

Meanwhile, Jack's work remained satisfactory and his responsibilities increased through the Winter and Spring, with several exceptions. His supervisor had received some complaints that he "burned rubber" leaving the school parking lot. Also, he seemed chronically short of money, which his supervisor blamed on his immaturity. In May, a series of consultations were held regarding the summer and Jack's future at the school. The supervisor felt Jack was an asset and could develop skills in ordering and stocking, but was nagged by his immature behavior. Furthermore, he had a limited budget for the summer and would need financial help to keep Jack on.

Jack himself was in a turmoil. He had proved that he could hold a job for nine months, but since he didn't accept

his disease he didn't seem to value his victory over it. He wanted other things -- a "respectable" salary and more freedom to be outdoors during the summer. He talked of accepting a casual house painting job with a friend.

At this crisis point, another conference was held with supervisor, client and Counselor. The job in the summer would include driving errands but also some stock work and kitchen maintenance. Jack thought the kitchen would be hot in the summer but might stay if he could have a raise. His supervisor evaluated Jack's work for him and said he could have a raise and some flexibility in hours. After this conference, Jack decided to keep his job, his main reason being that the supervisor had been so kind to him.

By this time, the Counselor and planner began to hope that Jack's job at the school would become permanent. Fortunately, Jack's wife was now near the top of the waiting list for enrollment in WIN, and she entered counseling. She was determined to enter clerical work and arrangements were made in July for her to start Adult Basic Education. Jack remained basically opposed to this step but he did not prevent it. When she actually earned her high school equivalency in the fall, he admitted to a bit of pride in her.

In June, then, the Counselor had two reasons for extending Jack's subcontract with the school for six months. First, his supervisor was still concerned about his immaturity and second, Jack would need the Welfare income until his wife went to work. It was hoped that in six months she could complete her equivalency and also a basic clerical course.

The final arrangements were a six month subcontract extension at 50% reimbursement and a salary of $2.50 for 35 hours, raised to 40 hours in September. The summer hours were arranged from 7 a.m. to 2 p.m. so that Jack had most of the afternoon free. He would earn a two week vacation in August. Despite this favorable arrangement, the summer did not go well.

In July, Jack injured his knee and then his toe and missed seven days of work. Shortly after, he called in sick again but was tripped up when his wife phoned asking for him. His supervisor expressed great disappointment in his attitudes. It was arranged that Jack should give up one of his vacation weeks instead of losing his income.

There was another problem that did not come to light until the fall: during the summer, the supervisor delegated authority to his chief assistant, a rather sharp tongued woman who was very strict with Jack. Much of his indifferent behavior was probably caused by dislike for this new boss, but he never complained about it and no one realized it until the damage had been done.

A third problem was increased friction with his wife, due probably to her new independence. She complained that he was never home, sometimes gone all night, and that when he did come home, they fought continuously. Jack himself was worried and requested marital counseling. The couple attended one interview with the psychologist at the Welfare Department but Jack lost heart and refused to return.

In the fall, Jack took up his old delivery route and matters improved slightly. However, the school had purchased a brand new and highly visible panel truck. Reports came to the supervisor that Jack was misusing the truck for his own errands during working hours. The supervisor, still disappointed in Jack's summer performance, rightly felt that this reflected badly on the school and on him and warned Jack that he didn't have many chances left.

Several other problems were threatening the family's progress. His wife was much slower to receive her high school equivalency than expected and the date of her working was uncertain. Also, when Jack completed his training he would lose Medicaid and would have to wait three months to enroll in the school's Blue Cross program. They could not make any exceptions in this enrollment policy despite Jack's special needs. The only way that the planner could devise to maintain insurance coverage was to delay reporting his training termination for several weeks. Payments were normally not terminated for four to six weeks after notification anyway, so most of the three months might be covered.

In mid-November, only six weeks before scheduled completion of training, an event occurred that caused Jack's immediate dismissal. The summer supervisor criticized him for taking too long a coffee break. Angry, he loaded his truck and gunned it out of the parking lot, menacing two pedestrians. Unfortunately, one of the pedestrians was the Assistant Principal who went immediately to the supervisor and demanded that Jack be fired.

After dismissing him, the supervisor sent a contrite and slightly unbelieving Jack to the Counselor. It was only in discussing the incident that Jack's dislike for the woman, the cause of so much summer friction, was discovered. In a subsequent phone call to the supervisor, the Counselor shared this insight, but both agreed that the explanation could not excuse the behavior this time.

Jack, still hoping for another chance, returned to his supervisor to ask if he should approach the Assistant Principal himself. This was not encouraged. The supervisor did agree to give Jack a recommendation to any employer who asked. After several days, Jack had to accept the loss of his job and sadly told the Counselor that he knew he would never have such a good boss.

He made half-hearted attempts to find work through several contacts in delivery work, but he had lost what little confidence he had gained and was not a convincing applicant. Participation in the E&D program had apparently not overcome years of maladjustment to his disease, nor modified the self-defeating attitudes which accompanied it.

Jack's wife, incidently, attended a clerical course for three days and decided that she hated typing. She changed her goal to salesclerk, but has not been able to find work, nor has the WIN team been able to place her.

B. Ronald K.

Ronald K. was referred in a phone call by a Community Action Agency Alcoholic Rehabilitation specialist. The client had just been released from a 30 day self-commitment to the State Hospital where he had hoped to gain control over his alcoholic problem. According to the specialist, the client was "desperate" for work -- he had no money and many bills including $50 a week alimony, which he owed his wife and their two children from whom he was separated. Since it seemed that he could meet E&D eligibility requirements (low-income and having children to support[1]), the Counselor made an appointment to see him.

Throughout the first interview, the client exhibited a very high anxiety level. He was pale, tense, and politely resistant to the Counselor's efforts to get to know him. He gave minimal information about himself: age 35, temporarily residing with his parents, unemployed five months. With regard to his health, the client stated that he drank when depressed, but was now taking Antabuse, a drug commonly prescribed to reinforce the user's willpower. (If taken faithfully, it will cause a person who then drinks in addition to become violently nauseated.)

The client had left school in the tenth grade, and had joined the service where he earned a high school equivalency. After two tours of duty, mostly in supply work, he was honorably discharged. He was vague about his jobs after that, but in the last several years they had been seasonal, casual labor: rough carpentry, roofing, cement finishing, and plumber's helper. His most recent job had been three and a half months in sheet metal work at $4.39 an hour.

The client stressed that he now sought steady rather than seasonal work. His first choice would be a job involving driving. However, he had lost his license five years previously for "Driving While Intoxicated" and could not afford the mandatory insurance which would permit him to regain it. His second choice then, was maintenance, not including painting, which he disliked.

---

[1]For eligibility income tables, see APPENDIX A.

The Counselor felt that despite his great anxiety, Ron showed signs of fair intelligence and some common sense. However, he declined to take the aptitude test or to discuss an idea such as "vocational planning". He reiterated that all he wanted was a steady job with a living wage. He also declined to be referred to Vocational Rehabilitation for a physical evaluation stating that he had just had one at the State Hospital and that he felt fine. Thus the first interview ended.

Ronald caused an ambivalent reaction in the Counselor. A man who had been alcoholic for at least five years, probably longer, and who was depending on a crude drug for sobriety looked like a bad risk. Still, Ronald was unusually persistent, calling a number of times in the next three weeks to ask about work. Special Work was certainly his only hope of employment: it was mid-winter and there were absolutely no jobs for semi-skilled construction workers. The E&D program was at this time still trying to offer help to everyone eligible and was even experimenting with Special Work as stopgap employment.[1] Also, the staff was trying to fill a quota of slots to give the program statistical value.

During this time, the Manpower Specialist was negotiating for a group of slots at several nonprofit institutions including a high school and the University of Vermont. The effort was to backlog a variety of Special Work slots in commonly requested jobs such as custodial work and maintenance. Ronald said he was not interested in custodial, but he was in maintenance and he agreed to come in and discuss it.

The Special Work maintenance jobs at the University were attractive: they paid $2.81 an hour and offered a variety of tasks such as general construction maintenance, plumber's helper, and electrician's helper. As a public institution, their funding was tight and E&D agreed to pay 105% (including a benefits package) of the salary for six months. However, having many employees meant that turnover always occurred and that a client who performed satisfactorily could be assured of a permanent steady job with vacation and sick pay, and health and retirement benefits.

This seemed to suit Ronald's stated goal and an appointment was made for him to be interviewed by the University personnel officer and the maintenance chief. Before he left the Counselor's office, he was introduced to the Coach and her role was explained. If he were hired, she would perform routine follow-up to see if he liked his work or was having any problems.

---

[1] For a full discussion of the selection of E&D clients, please see Section III A.

The staff explained Ron's alcoholic problem briefly to the personnel officer who passed the information on to the maintenance supervisor. If Ron had any trouble, they were requested to call the Coach. After his interview, Ron was accepted and started work shortly. His work was satisfactory for seven days, but when he failed to report or call in at the end of the second week, the Coach was notified.

Several frustrating days passed while the Coach tried to reach Ronald at his parents' home; when she finally did, he said he was terribly sick with a cold and flu. The Coach asked if Ronald had been to a doctor, but he answered no, he couldn't afford it. The Coach offered to set up a doctor's appointment through Vocational Rehabilitation and to transport him there, to which Ron agreed.

She made the arrangements by phone and followed up with a paper referral. However, when she went to pick him up, his mother said he had disappeared the day before. No one saw or heard from him again.

The staff suspected that Ron had returned to drinking. When the Counselor called the Community Action Agency specialist who had originally referred Ron, he said he knew nothing about the client and, in fact, hadn't known him very well.

The staff began to learn several things from their experience with Ronald. First, alcoholism is one of the most frustrating problems that programs are asked to deal with. Ron's condition was not at all affected by providing him with a job. He was sincere in his attempt to stop drinking, but his pride was false and he was, in fact, avoiding relationships with anyone who might cause him to face his real problems. The program could only effectively assist an alcoholic who demonstrated in deeds his sincerity: regular participation in Alcoholics Anonymous was a good sign, for instance.

Another lesson: referral sources and clients differed widely in their understanding and expectations of the E&D program. The alcoholic specialist in this case, undoubtedly, did not say to Ron: "Go to E&D and they will help you with your problems." Instead he said "Go to E&D and they will get you a job." Neither he nor the client distinguished the program from a placement service in which the applicant is referred to any available job for which he meets the qualifications.

At it inception, the E&D program chose to work with the "hard-core" unemployed and committed itself not just to the placement but to the "success" of the client. Commitment to the broader social purpose remained, although emphasis shifted to clients more likely to succeed.[1] Subsequent alcoholic referrals,

---

[1]Cf. Section III A.

for instance, were reviewed with great care.

C. Jan P.

In Spring, 1971, a community organizer for the local Community Action Agency approached the E&D Manpower Specialist with a plan for a cooperative food store. The store would accept membership from low-income families, buy food wholesale, and sell it at cost to the members. It would be guided by a committee of volunteer citizens and operated by a manager and two clerks from the low-income group. Overhead would be paid by membership dues. Until the store was running smoothly, it was hoped that the employee's salaries could be paid with E&D funds. The store was soon incorporated as a nonprofit business and a subcontract negotiated to employ three clients for six months at 90% reimbursement.

The co-op committee had two members from the low-income group whom they wanted to hire as salesclerks at $1.95 an hour. These two were interviewed by the Counselor and since both met E&D requirements and were reasonably suited to the work, they were enrolled.

The store still needed a manager, a job paying $3.00 an hour and requiring some experience in ordering, bookkeeping, and personnel management. The Counselor referred a well-qualified low-income man but he lost the job after several alcoholic episodes. A second client worked three weeks and then suffered a recurrence of circulatory problems and had to be hospitalized. Thinking that this client might recover and be able to return, the co-op committee proposed as a temporary replacement another of the co-op members.

Thus, Jan P. was sent to the Counselor to be interviewed. It was quickly established that she qualified for the program: she had three children and was married to a man who earned $90 a week, below the guidelines for a family of five.[1]

Jan was an attractive and confident 28 year old woman with a good history. She had been an assembly machine operator for two years but left that job for a more interesting one as a clerk in the town's best department store. There for two years, she did sales, inventory, and stock work. She felt she had acquired a lot of responsibility on this job and was amazed that her salary had never risen above her starting pay of $1.65 an hour. She left the job to have her third child, but now wanted to work again to supplement her husband's income.

Jan had finished the 11th grade in school. She had taken the General Aptitude Test Battery[2] several years previously and the scores were on file. Actually, her best scores by far were manual and finger dexterity. Her numerical and verbal

[1] See APPENDIX A.
[2] See APPENDIX E.

scores were below average and her clerical score was about average. She was not, then, as well educated or intelligent as either of the men referred as managers, but she had a cheerful, capable manner which suited her to dealing with the public.

The Counselor explained to Jan that her job might be temporary and that her salary level would be determined by the co-op committee. Jan's one concern was childcare. It was June and her two older children were out of school. She suggested that all three could spend the day at a nearby Catholic orphanage where she herself had grown up. She did want help with financing and was pleased to hear that as a trainee she would be entitled to childcare funds.

At this point, Jan was introduced to the Coach and the childcare procedures were discussed. The local Community Coordinated Childcare Committee (4-C) administered the money allocated to the State Office of Child Development as part of the E&D experiment, as well as on-going title IV-A funds. Eligibility for the childcare funds was easy to establish: the coach submitted a request[1] to the committee who in turn visited the childcare "vendor" and arranged billing procedures. Jan would not have to pay anything out of her pocket, as long as she was a trainee, the childcare was free. Jan left, satisfied with the arrangements.

In a call to a representative of the co-op committee, the Counselor discussed Jan's eligibility and childcare arrangements. It was mutually agreed, however, that Jan's experience did not merit a salary of $3.00 and the representative suggested $1.95 to start. Since this was a $.30 raise from her previous job, Jan was satisfied and she shortly started work.

The previous Manager remained ill and Jan quickly established herself as an energetic and reliable worker. Furthermore, the cooperative venture was doing well under the guidance of the organizer and the committee.

Through the summer and into the fall, Jan requested from the staff only one minor service. The orphanage, which had agreed to take her children as a favor and to charge a nominal sum of ten dollars a week per child, was not receiving reimbursement from 4-C. The Coach investigated the delay which turned out to be administrative and the bills got paid. When her older children returned to school, Jan efficiently found a neighbor to watch them in the afternoon and agreed to pay the woman $10 a week. Apparently, she did not realize that 4-C could pay the neighbor also.

---

[1] See APPENDIX H.

By November, the original two salesgirls had been replaced by two new trainees. The local Community Action Agency indicated that they would like to hire Jan. Although the store did not have enough income to cover her salary, she could be paid with Community Action Agency funds.

When the Counselor talked to Jan about permanent employment, several problems emerged. One was that Jan would lose eligibility for childcare funds 60 days after ending her traineeship. The Counselor suggested that Jan might get funds from Title IV-A of the Social Security Act although with two incomes in the family, it was not likely.

She also confessed that she had a lot of bills and that her husband was very depressed, partly because of this. He had seen a doctor and they were afraid he might have to stop work. Jan wondered if she could get a raise from the Community Action Agency and finally agreed to ask them.

Jan became a permanent employee of the Community Action Agency, but she did not get a raise at that time. Furthermore, the childcare problem was nagging. First, the orphanage, which had received 4-C funds, was not licensed to receive IV-A funds so Jan changed to a sitter who charged $20 a week for her youngest. Then in January, Jan was found ineligible for IV-A funds and she began to pay all childcare costs herself.

In February, after a great deal of agitation on her own behalf, Jan got a $6.00 a week raise. She argued rightly that her responsibilities had increased: she was managing the clerks, doing the bookkeeping nights and having to make some policy decisions.

In May, when the E&D Coach did a final six month follow-up, Jan was still working and still getting good references from her Community Action Agency employer. The store, however, was in trouble. The organizer had withdrawn, leaving management to the volunteer committee. Apparently their interests had waned and Jan had assumed responsibilities she was not trained to handle. Membership fell off; also, the salesclerks did not get along with each other and began to argue with Jan. One of them accused her of charging $10.00 a week childcare to the operating expenses of the store. Whatever was the truth in the conflicting stories that reached the Counselor, it was clear that a disastrous lack of leadership had developed.

It was not a surprise when the store ceased operations in June, a year after it had started and only a month after Jan had been counted an E&D success as its manager. Bitter about the outcome, Jan decided to stay home with her children that summer and, as far as the staff knows, has not sought other employment since. Jan had been an unusually self-reliant client, requiring very little from the staff beyond routine follow-up. It was not she who failed, but the job which failed her.

D. Alice D.

Alice D. was referred to E&D in a phone call from her service planner in the Welfare Department. Although she was on the waiting list for WIN, the planner felt that Alice would benefit particularly from E&D's ability to "buy her a job." She had been unemployed for a year and a half and had tried very hard to find work on her own. She and her two boys lived on a Welfare grant of $165 plus a small alimony payment.

Alice had an Associate degree in nursing and had worked eight years, the last three on psychiatric wards at the Medical Center. During these last three years, she had suffered serious depressions, due perhaps to marital problems, and had been hospitalized on three occasions. She was now under a psychiatrist's care and was very anxious to work again, although not as a psychiatric nurse.

The planner explained that Alice wanted retraining so she would have a better chance in the labor market. She had, in fact, found herself a job recently in an orthopedic store where the manager had promised her clerical training and an assistant managership. But after three weeks, he let her go saying he didn't have enough money to keep her. This particular businessman was notorious for playing this trick on young women and, even though Alice had heard about it, she still felt crushed when she lost the job. Her confidence, badly shaken to start with, was totally destroyed in the episode. The planner felt that if E&D could assure her some kind of a job, she could recover some of it.

Alice's first interviews with the E&D Counselor were in early December, 1971. She was obviously intelligent but so tense that it seemed a big effort for her to speak. Slowly and deliberately, she repeated much of what the planner had told the Counselor. She described her hospitalizations and said she was still seeing her psychiatrist twice a month and taking Valium. She consented readily to being referred to Vocational Rehabilitation for evaluation.

Alice also stated that since psychiatric nursing seemed inadvisable, she wanted social work. For this she wanted to complete a BA degree and an MSW degree, the latter not even available in Vermont. She had already investigated on her own the requirements for a BA at the University.

The plan seemed over-ambitious to the Counselor and there was a lengthy discussion about social service work. E&D had had good luck in placing clients in entry-level social service jobs with agencies such as Planned Parenthood and daycare centers. The Counselor also suggested that Alice might benefit from any temporary job in which she dealt with people and regained her confidence. Alice agreed.

The Counselor had referred her to Vocational Rehabilitation

who in turn was trying to contact her psychiatrist for an evaluation. It is an irony of the case that the doctor did not respond for seven months, long after Alice had succeeded in a placement. Meanwhile, in an effort to get some advice on Alice's condition, the Counselor called her hospital social worker. His guarded evaluation was that Alice "had some potential" but needed "long-range institutional support." He agreed that she shouldn't attempt psychiatric nursing.

Alice herself persisted in asking for work. Unsure of the client's health, the Counselor thought through possible slots which might interest, but not burden, her. At that time several clerical slots at $1.88 an hour were available at the University. The Counselor spoke to the Personnel Officer about a position which would suit a girl with a history of emotional problems and he had a good solution: the Counseling and Testing Division, run by a sympathetic psychologist, was very anxious to have a temporary receptionist through May.

Alice liked the idea of working at the University, but was having trouble with stomach cramps and would call back. The Counselor worried about the wisdom of the placement, but Alice recovered, interviewed, was accepted and planned to start work as soon as suitable childcare could be arranged. Her supervisor had been told that she had a history of emotional problems, but his policy was to treat her normally and help only if she requested it.

The Coach had by this time met Alice and was working to solve her childcare needs. Her two boys were in school, but needed lunch and after school care. Alice herself found a neighbor who could give them lunch and the Coach requested financing through the State Office of Child Development. There was an afternoon activities program funded by E&D at the YMCA, but one boy was a year too young. The Coach contacted the organizer and got special permission for both boys to attend.

Just before starting work in mid-January, Alice had another request. She had still not completely given up her idea of completing a BA and she knew that the E&D program had some funds for enrichment training. She wanted to take a psychology course which would give her background for her work in the Counseling Service. The Counselor submitted a request for approval[1] to the E&D Central Office and when that approval was received, sent a letter requesting registration to the University Registrar. The Registrar, used to WIN and E&D clients, responded with the appropriate form letter and later sent bills. Alice was enrolled in the course.

After she had worked two weeks, the staff performed a routine follow-up and was glad to learn that Alice liked her work and that her supervisor was pleased. In the following weeks, her confidence and poise increased and she became a considerable, albeit temporary, asset to the Counseling Service. Alice and the

[1] See APPENDIX F.

Counselor agreed that if she continued to progress, she might want to think about a more challenging job.

In February, Alice's car broke down badly and she called to ask if E&D could help her repair it. The program did have some funds for auto repairs if the car was needed for transportation to work. The Coach helped Alice get estimates and submitted with a training related expense form[1] to the E&D Central Office. In this case, the cost was over $350.00 and the Central Office denied it. Alice solved the problem herself; although she had a lot of bills, she was able to borrow the money to fix the car.

In March, Alice's life took a turn which filled the staff with surprise and apprehension: she became engaged to a man she had known for only a month and set a wedding date in April. The staff learned that her fiance had his own emotional problems and was living on 100% disability from the Armed Services. The Counselor visited Alice's supervisor and warned him briefly that Alice's marriage might create problems for her.

In fact, quite the opposite occurred. Alice arranged to take a week's vacation, married, moved to a new apartment and returned to work more confident and happier than ever. She was handling her responsibilities beautifully in the office and at home.

In early May she called the Counselor to say she wished for a more challenging job when her slot ended at the Counseling Service. She wanted, in fact, to go back into nursing, not with psychiatric patients, but perhaps in an agency with a lot of social responsibilities. She wondered if E&D could help her.

Alice's Welfare grant had closed when she married. She certainly needed to supplement her husband's pension. The E&D policy was to continue clients in the program until they were successfully and permanently employed. So Alice would be eligible for a second slot, hopefully as a nurse. The Counselor agreed to call some agencies, but also suggested that Alice seek work on her own.

The Counselor in the next three weeks contacted the Visiting Nurses, Planned Parenthood, and the county Mental Health Agency, but was not able to develop a slot. Then Alice called to report that she had found a job as a general duty nurse in a nursing home. She finished her slot at the Counseling Service in early June and went right to work at the nursing home for $3.25 an hour.

Alice has maintained this employment for a full year and has sought no further help from any agency. Here is the rare case in which plans fell into place as designed and success seems complete. No one can say that she will never suffer a recurrence of her depression, but the Welfare Department and the Employment Service gave appropriate help when she needed it and she used it well.

---

[1] See APPENDIX G.

SECTION III

ANALYSIS

A. Some Characteristics of the E&D Program and Its Participants

A client selected for the E&D program had to meet two criteria: he had to be liable for the support of children and his income had to fall below guidelines on a graduated table.[1] If a client was receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) from the Department of Welfare, he was automatically eligible. If the client was not Welfare dependent, the Counselor could quickly determine eligibility by asking about his family and his income. Income was computed for the three months preceding the initial interview and annualized by multiplying by four.

Several of the Counselors found that about half their caseload was Welfare dependent; others reported up to 95% on AFDC and simultaneously enrolled in WIN. This can be explained historically. The E&D program started operations in Burlington and Morrisville in October 1970 with a staff of five (Manager, Counselor, Manpower Specialist, Coach, and clerk) hired and trained for each office. Burlington, the largest Employment Office in the State, already had two WIN Counselors, four regular (or non-WIN) Counselors, and a Counseling Supervisor. None of these people was free to undertake the management of a special caseload of up to 60 enrollees. The staff in Morrisville had to establish an Employment Office in an area that had been served only by itinerant personnel. So both areas had a Counselor who was hired to work only with E&D clients and to build a caseload from zero. This meant that the Burlington and Morrisville Counselors acted in part as recruiters and screeners. They accepted clients from WIN but also from other sources (as with Ronald K. and Jan P.).

When the E&D program was extended across the state nine months later, it simply became an added resource for Counselors working with their established caseloads. Special Work was treated as a component of WIN, just like ON-The-Job-Training, or Work Experience. The advantage of this second method of procedure is that the Counselor knows his caseload and does not need to recruit clients. His emphasis is not on making the program work, but on helping the clients he already knows.

---

[1] See APPENDIX A.

The full value and flexibility of Special Work emerged only gradually, though. Originally, the program was committed to work with so called "hard-core unemployables" and it emphasized a variety of services that were thought to be needed to help its "difficult" clients succeed. In Burlington especially, the staff recruited the toughest cases from WIN and regular Counselors and lavished attention on them -- with discouraging results and a dismal placement rate.

A brief example is the case of Paul N., a retarded man who had been institutionalized much of his life. Paul was a regular customer at the Employment Service, coming in every few months to see Counselors and request training, particularly in radio repair. He was referred to the E&D Counselor who, after several interviews, got Paul to agree that kitchen helper might be a suitable job. The Manpower Specialist developed a special slot in the kitchen of a private school under a supervisor who had had good success with retarded workers.

Paul worked less than three weeks and required attention from the Coach and/or Counselor almost every day. His capabilities and insights were so limited that he required the most basic of supports. First he needed help with the bus schedule, and then a week's bus fare (paid with Training Related Expense money). He misunderstood the joking of his fellow workers and thought they disliked him. Although he said he liked washing pots, he did not like waiting an hour between meals with no work. He finally quit because the meat he was served for lunch was too rare. After this experience, he continued to frequent the Employment Service asking for radio repair.

Paul might have done better in a sheltered workshop if one had been available, but in any case it seems reasonable to expect that he will always be maintained with public funds. His is an extreme case of "hard-core unemployability" but there are many others— people who are chronically dependent on public systems of support. They include some multi-problem families for whom Welfare becomes an easy way of life because it is too great an effort to cope on their own. Jack H. may fit in this category.

Slowly over its months of operation, then, the E&D program shifted its emphasis to clients who promised to make better use of Special Work. Not surprisingly, clients who did well in the program tended to be well-motivated to start with and generally more intelligent and self-reliant. Nevertheless, all E&D enrollees were members of low-income families with children, and more than half were welfare dependent.

A few E&D clients who succeeded (like Jan P.) might have done so on their own if labor market conditions had been more favorable. But many, like Alice D. really did need special support. Often it is impossible for the Counselor to know until he tries it out which clients will succeed. His basic goal becomes helping the client to make a satisfactory adjustment to permanent employment

and he combines the best clients with whatever resources he can muster to that end.

Counselors feel that women are generally easier to work with than men, probably because their worst problem is often inexperience. Men, like Ron K., tend to have worked and failed and their problems seem more intransigent. They feel that there were no characteristics separating Welfare recipients from non-Welfare -- the groups presented about the same difficulties. Every Counselor acknowledges a small group of clients (estimates range from five percent to 20%) who are simply not motivated to work, even though they say they are. Jack H.'s motivation, for instance, started out rather strong but declined through training -- work was too much of an effort and independence too much of a risk. If a client has no desire to work, there is nothing the Counselor can do to instill it. For the great majority, though, work is socially acceptable and desirable, and Special Work can provide a variety of opportunities.

For example, it could provide entry into the labor market for an inexperienced worker and it could provide time for skill building. Some of the most successful clients were young women who had finished clerical training, but had never worked. In Vermont's very tight labor market, they could rarely find jobs, but six months' subsidized employment could give them experience and often an "in" with their supervisors.

Special Work was sometimes used as institutionalized training for paraprofessional social service jobs. Across the state, a number of clients became outreach workers for Planned Parenthood, nutrition aides for the University Extension Service and aides in day care facilities.

Sometimes a client would be assigned to Special Work because he seemed to need a lot of encouragement and support, as did Jack H. and Alice D. For both, plaements also provided evaluation of health problems and consequent employability. And for Alice, Special Work was a kind of stopgap employment, until she was ready to undertake her own vocation.

Entry level jobs, skill building, service supports, evaluation of employability, stopgap employment -- no other resources of the Employment Service could meet such a variety of client needs. Special Work, with its emphasis on coaching and services, was designed to deliver a higher level of support than, say, WIN On-The-Job-Training. Besides it could reimburse salaries up to 100% rather than the 50% common to OJT. It did have a serious limitation in being restricted to nonprofit agencies; a client who wanted to learn sheet metal work had to have an OJT contract.

WIN had a 13 week Work Experience component, but it only paid a $30 a month stipend. It was certainly more attractive to a client to sample work at a full salary in Special Work.

Occasionally the Employment Service offered a course under

the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) in areas such as clerical, cooking, and nurses' aide work. The problem was that placement in the tight labor market was often difficult. The E&D program was able to give experience and ultimately permanent jobs to several clients who had completed MDTA training.

The E&D program defined success as completion of the subsidized work period and retention of a permanent job six months afterward. After two years of operation, the program was having a much greater success rate, even though unemployment rates remained as high as 6.5%. All the Counselors felt that they would miss having Special Work as a resource when the program ended.

B. Selection of Employers

There was only one absolute requirement for a Special Work employer: it had to be a nonporfit corporation. It could be public such as a school, a municipal department, a State agency, or private such as a hospital or community service organization. Of course an urban area offers a much greater number of agencies than a rural one does, and therefore more jobs in greater variety. Neither area, however, could offer industrial jobs such as machine work or assembly since subcontracts were limited to nonprofit agencies. This limitation was to prevent a profit-making business gaining unfair advantage over its competitors through government subsidies. It was certainly a limitation to the clients, for it left a whole range of jobs which the Counselors could not help them to enter.

During the course of the program, the staff developed another criterion for Special Work employers: they had to give a substantial assurance that if the trainee completed his subcontract satisfactorily, he would be hired permanently. At first, Special Work had been regarded as an end in itself or as a transition to a similar job in private industry. But this had drawbacks: six months subsidized employment was not very meaningful if the client couldn't keep working. With the high levels of unemployment, it was usually impossible to find a similar job. Furthermore, just because a client could adjust satisfactorily to one employer didn't mean he could necessarily adjust to a second. Changing jobs can be a big effort especially for a person with some problem or handicap.

For all these reasons then, the program came to emphasize promise of permanent employment. Exceptions were allowed at the Counselor's discretion and were sometimes useful, as in the case of Alice D. Nothing was put in the subcontract which legally required the employer to hire the client and if he failed to do so, there were no penalties imposed. Very few employers abused this trust, however.

On the E&D team, the Manpower Specialist was specifically charged with developing Special Work slots, and with writing

and maintaining the subcontracts. This staff member was familiar with the labor market in this area and worked closely with the Counselor in finding suitable employers. Slots were developed in three main ways -- for an individual, in a pool, or either, at the request of an employer.

The Counselor might request a particular job for a client and even special circumstances, such as a good supervisor for Paul N. The Manpower Specialist would then seek a suitable employer and try to interest him in the program and the client. This individula slot development was sometimes excellent but it was time-consuming and often frustrating because some employers were unable or unwilling to help.

Alice D. represents a full example. Her receptionist slot was individually planned (although written in an existing slot pool) and it worked beautifully. On the other hand, efforts to find her a slot as a nurse were futile: one of the agencies contacted did not want to take on a nurse with past emotional illness; others simply didn't have the budget to offer her permanent employment.

The second and more common method of development was the "slot pool," in which the Manpower Specialist contacted a large employer and proposed to write a subcontract for a wide variety of jobs. He might have a few clients in mind, but generally he was seeking jobs in frequent demand. One of the best slot pools in Burlington was with the University which subcontracted for an electrician's helper, two general maintenance workers, two groundskeepers, two receptionists and a bookkeeper. This gave the Counselor some alternatives to discuss with clients.

The one big disadvantage to slot pools was that the staff lost control over the choice of direct supervisors. The high school subcontract under which Jack worked for his very patient boss also covered a number of custodial slots under a very unsatisfactory supervisor. This particular man was short-tempered and hard-willed; his was one of the few departments where E&D clients ran into prejudice and ridicule for their Welfare status. It turned out that the reason this supervisor wanted trainees was that he couldn't keep his own help. Needless to say, few clients succeeded under this supervisor.

The third and least satisfactory method of slot development occurred when an employer took the initiative in contacting E&D for a subcontract. An employer seeking subsidy in this way was often a new or marginal business and there was a much greater risk that the slot would not result in permanent employment. The Food Co-op for which Jan P. worked is an example. Furthermore, employers who came to E&D had often chosen their own clients, such as Jan. But employers were not always the best judges of the clients or their potential. A few subcontracts of this type did work out, but essentially they emphasized the needs of the employer over those of the client and therefore they ran counter to the purposes of the E&D program.

To summarize then, the E&D staff was seeking not just quantity, but quality in slots. The best employers were those who could guarantee permanent work and whose supervisors were willing to take a personal interest in the progress of the client.

C. Service Needs

One of the purposes of the E&D program was to find out what problems prevented a client from working and succeeding and what services might be provided to alleviate the problems. The staff expected to meet difficulties with transportation, childcare, physical and emotional illness, and inadequate housing, among others.

Service needs were also called "barriers to employment" during the program and although the terms sound alike, there is quite a difference. "Service needs" implies a problem which can be solved somehow; "barrier" suggests a more serious condition for which no obvious solution exists. For example, the need for childcare was usually easy to serve. On the other hand, alcoholism was such a formidable barrier that it sounds foolish under the label "service need." What service, or set of services, would be sufficient to overcome the problems of a Ronald K?

The Counselor's task, then, is not only to identify which problems a client has, but also which have a reasonable chance of being overcome. His first interview covers at least the topics listed in the counseling folder[1] and should give the Counselor some assessment of the client's potential. Of course, Counselors will differ in their assessments according to the extent of their experience and degree of personal optimism.

A few Counselors have formalized for their own use a "problem identification" style which clearly lists the problems that must be met before the client can be successful. This list is discussed frankly with the client and he is encouraged to share in the search for solutions. Hopefully, in this way he is made an ally with the Counselor in pursuit of employment.

Counselors could also seek evaluation from other sources and agencies. For instance, Vocational Rehabilitation had the specific responsibility of assessing physical and emotional health for E&D clients. If a client complained of a bad back, VR collected records from his physicians and/or hospitalizations and interpreted them for the ES Counselor. Or if the problem was a new occurrence, VR could arrange and pay for an appropriate physical or psychological examination. This consultation could be a great help if received quickly. Sometimes though, the evaluations were so slow in returning that they became useless. If Alice D. had waited for her psychiatrist's written opinion, she would probably still be unemployed.

[1] See APPENDIX C.

It was always helpful to the Counselor to have the opinion of the service planner regarding the clients in Welfare. This is true partly because it helps to have some background and a second opinion in dealing with a client. But also, the planner's job is to identify the needs of the client's family such as inability to budget income, or inadequate housing. Such problems might go unnoticed by the ES Counselor unless they became crises that threatened to ruin placement. For families not on Welfare, the lack of a planner made work harder for the ES staff. It meant that the Counselor or Coach had to fill in, as best they could, the planner's role. So they might find themselves describing family budgeting or teaching a client to drive or transporting a sick child to a doctor.

These examples suggest several other aspects of service needs: they are not all evident during the initial assessment and they vary tremendously in type and importance. The category of "transportation needs", for example, breaks down into a variety of problems. Three of the four sample cases had "transportation needs". Ronald K. wanted a driving job but needed a license. This was not solved but ignored. If Ronald had lived in a rural area with no public bus available, it would have precluded work for him altogether. Alice D's car broke down during training but she stayed on the job by riding to work with a neighbor until her car was fixed. Jack's "transportation need" was to learn self-control: he spent too much income on his car and he drove it recklessly. Despite repeated suggestions from his Counselor, planner, and supervisor, these problems persisted and eventually caused his failure.

Another aspect of service needs is this: some clients have many more needs than others. Among the sample cases, Jan had few requests and Alice had an average number. Both showed self-reliance in a number of areas and both succeeded in their jobs. By contrast, Jack H. had many needs and although these were handled one by one with staff help, Jack himself never learned to cope with them. His problems were allayed for a year and a half but they were never solved. Therefore he might be described as a chronic social dependent.

Counselors might find that half their caseloads consisted of people who were unemployed due to lack of experience or a tight labor market. The other half consisted of people like Jack who continually needed support in coping with the problems of working and living. A few of the latter, with a lot of luck, might make the delicate transition from dependence to independence. But many would never be independent. If they were to keep working, they would probably need permanent subsidy and continuing follow-up and support from agency staff.

This seemed especially true in the case of unemployed fathers with many children to support. Unless they were unusually bright or talented, they would always have trouble earning as much money as they could receive on AFDC. During training an unemployed

father was entitled to a portion of his Welfare income (figured by a formula called the 30 1/3 disregard). But when he became permanently employed, he lost eligibility for this money as well as Medicaid. This situation upset clients at the least and sometimes caused the failure of the placement. It is no wonder that Counselors are discouraged about working with unemployed fathers with many children.

Women, on the other hand, are entitled to keep their disregards as long as their earnings did not exceed their needs. This was justified by the argument, largely true, that women do not have the potential to earn as much as men. This is not fair, however, to the woman who is not a Welfare recipient to begin with. Once employed, a woman could not go to the Welfare Office and request a partial grant to make up the difference between her income and her "needs."

The only other source of financial help available in E&D was free childcare, but this only lasted up to 60 days after training. Jan P. and family had financial problems and the loss of childcare funds exacerbated them. It may also have caused Jan to use funds at work indiscretely. It does seem that for women (and men) who are doing their best to earn a living, some sort of permanent financial supplement whether direct, as the disregard or indirect, as childcare, would be beneficial.

It takes experience and a very high level of effort for a Counselor to respond well to client needs. Service is not a product but a process, part of a dynamic relationship between Counselor and client. No matter how sensitive the Counselor is to the client's needs, some will arise unexpectedly or go unnoticed. The Counselor is not equally close to all clients, but then all clients do not need the same amount of attention.

In trying to stay abreast of every case, it is probably helpful for the Counselor or his delegate to perform routine follow-up at stated intervals. In this way, the staff takes the initiative in maintaining its relationship to the client and hopefully can catch problems before they become crises.

D. Service Resources

The availability of resources to meet client needs varied from area to area around the state. Some resources were built into the E&D program and were available to every Counselor for use with every client. Others were available through cooperating agencies and differed somewhat according to the makeup of the agency and the type of agreement formed with them. The third group of resources were those available in local communities and these differed greatly between urban and rural areas.

Built into the program were two funds, Training Related Expense (TRE) money and Enrichment money, and also a staff position called Coach. All three of these features existed in

certain forms in WIN, but variations in availability and use under E&D guidelines made them particularly valuable to the Counselor.

Training Related Expense money was a fund to provide goods or services essential to the commencement or continuance of training. It was often used for car tires, car repairs, work clothes, emergency bus fare or childcare, relocation funds, and tools. Although all of these items could theoretically be obtained by a WIN client, the procedures in E&D were slightly more efficient. If a client was enrolled in WIN and then placed in Special Work as a component, the Counselor usually chose to obtain items through TRE. (Procedures for doing so are described in the following section on Service Delivery.)

The Enrichment Fund was designed to pay for courses relating directly to the client's Special Work job and running concurrent with it. Thus a client placed as an office clerk might take an evening course in typing or stenography. An electrician's helper could study Electrical Wiring, and a daycare aide could enroll in a Child Development course. The WIN program had education and training components, but these usually preceded work experience or placement. There was no provision for a single course concurrent with work.

The WIN Program also provided for a Coach on the staff, a paraprofessional worker who was often chosen from the client group, performed the role of client advocate, and whose duties consisted largely of routine follow-up. When the E&D Program was adopted statewide, a Coach was hired and trained for each office to work specifically with E&D clients. Furthermore, in the spirit of experimentation, few guidelines were given for the Coach's role and each developed it somewhat according to his interests and strengths.

One Coach became an aggressive client advocate who represented client interests to the staff, the supervisor, the community at large, and the E&D Central Office. Another took over follow-ups and all paperwork from the Counselor. A third specialized in crisis intervention and was able to calm a client or supervisor in almost any emergency. Coaches provided a fair amount of one-time transportation, as for instance, taking a client to a job interview or a doctor's appointment. In fact, because the Coach was immediately available and had flexibility of role, he tended to develop into a "right arm" for the Counselor. one of the most valuable resources available.

There were three cooperating agencies in the State who participated in the E&D experiment: Vocational Rehabilitation, Social Welfare, and the Office of Child Development. In Burlington and Morrisville, VR and Welfare received special grants to develop supporting roles to the Manpower Project, and the Office of Child Development had experimental and demonstration funds to spend statewide. The Employment Service entered into written

agreements with these agencies, setting out responsibilities and interrelationships.

The role of VR as evaluator of physical and emotional illness has already been described in the preceding section. In Burlington and Morrisville they had further responsibilities: if a client had some chronic, severe handicap that affected his employability, VR could consider making him their own client. Jack H., for instance, was already in a VR caseload and the ES Counselor worked with VR in exploring the possibility of radio repair training. VR had the funds for travel and living allowance and tuition at the school, which E&D did not. VR could also provide minor medical services for any client up to a value of $100. This could pay for glasses, orthopedic shoes, or minor dental care.

Theoretically, all E&D clients in Burlington and Morrisville were eligible for services from Social Welfare too, but in practice it tended not to work this way. Clients such as Jack and Alice who already had service planners did receive service. Jack's planner counseled him on budgeting, tried to help with housing, helped his wife with dental care and family planning, and prepared Jack for transition from training without health insurance. The need for these services emerged out of the ongoing dynamic relationship between the planner and Jack and his family. Most of the services were not requested by the ES Counselor or the client for that matter, but were provided spontaneously by the planner because she kept in touch with the family and its changing needs.

A client not receiving Welfare could also be referred to a planner for service, but it meant sending him to a stranger in another agency. If the client had trouble with budget management, for instance, it was a real temptation for the ES staff to try to handle this themselves. In such a situation a Coach on the spot and familiar with the client seemed a much more natural resource.

Childcare funding was available statewide with very few restrictions. If the client had chosen her own sitter, the office of Child Development simply arranged billing. When asked, O.C.D. could also locate a sitter or daycare center which met the particular neess of the client's childcare. Efficiency of procedures varied tremendously from area to area as the childcare staffs underwent a series of reorganizations, but bills did eventually get paid. The other failing of this resource has been discussed in an earlier section: 60 days after the client completed training, she usually lost eligibility for childcare payments.

In Burlington, the largest city in Vermont, the Counselor could send a client to a great variety of other agencies for service: Adult Basic Education, Legal Aid, Planned Parenthood, Visiting Nurses, County Mental Health, Alcoholics Anonymous, and so on. In rural areas where perhaps only a few of these

organizations operated, and often on an itinerant basis, it was much harder to serve clients in the same ways. But even proximity of service did not insure that the client would seek help. Many clients were too shy or too unsure of their purpose or too impatient to accept referral to yet another public agency. Once a Counselor has won the trust of a client, he is bound to hear a fair amount about marital troubles, money troubles, health complaints and the like.

Sometimes when there is no obvious resource, Counselors have to create them. An example occurred in Morrisville when the E&D Staff wrote a slot pool for about forty clients at the Vermont State Hospital. Being a rural area, Morrisville had few employers of its own. The hospital was a 22 mile drive over winding roads but it offered a variety of badly needed jobs. Once a number of clients had been enrolled, the staff faced the problem of transporting them. They called a meeting of enrollees and were able to set up a number of car pools to meet different shifts. When one of the cars with four riders broke down, the staff financed repairs with Training Related Expense (TRE) money. All these arrangements resulted in permanent jobs for a number of people in a rural, depressed area.

The transportation problem was solved partially in this rural area because so many clients worked at the same place. But usually, lack of a car is an insurmountable barrier to employment for the rural poor. Even if it had been possible, none of the Counselors wanted to buy cars for the clients. It would be too expensive, too much of a free giveaway, too hard to handle administratively. But several Counselors did wish for a fund from which clients could borrow the money at little or no interest.

E. Service Delivery

Service delivery is the process of finding the best resource for a client's need and getting it to him. It deserves a special section because these mechanics seem to involve a great deal of the Counselor's time and attention. The E&D planners were careful to define procedures for all formal requests including Training Related Expense, Enrichment, Vocational Rehabilitation, Social Welfare, and Childcare. The Counselors almost always conducted business by phone but then followed requests with the appropriate form. They also developed procedures for keeping track of requests, such as a "tickler file," and would follow up lagging service with another phone call.

Training Related Expense requests[1] had to be filled out by the Counselor and mailed to the E&D Central Office in Montpelier for any item costing more than $19.99. A request costing less could be approved by the local Office Manager.

[1] See APPENDIX G.

If it involved a service such as a car repair, two estimates had to be submitted for review. Usually the Central Office mailed back the reply marked "approved" or "disapproved", but if the need was urgent, the answer was conveyed by telephone. Despite a great effort on the part of the Central Office to expedite requests, delays inevitably occurred. Some Counselors felt that the local office should have authority to commit more money, perhaps up to $100, which would give more leeway in emergencies. A second request was that local office staff be provided with an order number or identification number. Since all TRE purchases were charged and later billed to the Department of Employment Security, it was necessary to convince business men of the identity of the shopper and the State's willingness to pay.

Local offices were not allowed to have petty cash funds because of accounting problems. When a client needed a week's bus fare to start work, the Counselor was supposed to take money out of his own pocket and charge the Central Office on his monthly expense account. He would submit a TRE stating that because of urgent need he had already paid out the funds. Counselors felt this was a minor inconvenience.

Enrichment requests[1] were submitted for every client who wanted to take a suitable course to supplement his work experience. Once an initial authorization was received from the Central Office, the Counselor wrote a letter to the course registrar, requesting enrollment for the client. He also sent or dictated to the registrar a sample letter of response which contains a number of facts in a specific format. Once the client was enrolled, the registrar could send billing in duplicate to the Counselor to be forwarded to the Central Office. This process took an average of three weeks and forced the Counselor to look for client need well in advance of starting dates. It was modelled on WIN procedures and makes some sense if the client is enrolling in a year of school. However, it seems elaborate for the typical E&D request, a $30 typing course, for example.

Service delivery from Vocational Rehabilitation, Social Welfare, and Childcare was structured by formal reciprocal agreements among project staffs. These agreements stated what services would be the responsibility of each agency and what paperwork would be necessary to secure them. In reality, delivery depended a great deal on whether staffs were full and on the personalities of the people involved. They varied from place to place and from time to time in one place.

Vocational Rehabilitation requests[2] were often hampered by the delay in obtaining medical records from hospitals and doctors. Alice D.'s example of seven months is admittedly an extreme. Meanwhile the VR Counselors were busy with their own caseloads and perhaps let these routine evaluations slide.

---

[1] See APPENDIX F.

[2] See APPENDIX D.

Minor medical services such as glasses seemed to work smoothly, but dental care was a big exception. VR was authorized to pay up to $100 for an E&D enrollee, which would pay for a dental examination and perhaps a couple of fillings. Many clients, though, needed extensive work and the estimates frequently ranged from $300 - $500. If the teeth were so bad that they affected the client's general health, VR could change them to client status and "rehabilitate" them. Most, however, were just uncomfortable, not incapacitated. Medicaid did not cover dental work, WIN had some funds but these were cut back in 1972, so clients had no resource.

A few chose to have all their teeth pulled despite the fact that they had no prospect of getting dentures. The dental situation was a great frustration for clients and Counselors alike.

For requests to Social Welfare, the E&D planners devised a one page form[1] which would be initiated by the Counselor and filled out and returned when the service was performed. These forms were then used by the E&D Central Office as a way to catalog services requested and performed. Counselors, however, found it very difficult to keep up with these paper requests, although they recognized the need for standard methods of data accumulation in an experimental and demonstration project. Most were in almost daily phone contact with the service planners and information was shared easily in this way. Furthermore, service is better described as a process than the series of discrete requests for which the form was designed.

Another problem with service delivery from Social Welfare was mobility of staff. When the project started in Burlington, there were four planners involved. Within twenty-four months, three of them transferred out of the district and were replaced by three others who also left their jobs during a reorganization period. For several months, the unit operated with one planner and a supervisor. Clearly this was bound to affect the extent and quality of service available to E&D clients.

The Welfare Department in Burlington devised an interesting experiment by setting up a Resource Unit. This consisted of a group of six workers, each responsible for cataloguing resources in specific areas such as housing, transportation, childcare, chelth care, and so on. Under the terms of the referral procedures, however, the employment Counselor could not contact the unit directly. Instead, he had to contact the client's service planner and ask him to make the request. Thus the resource unit worker was asked to provide a service for a client he did not know and whose story he got third hand. By contrast, an ES Coach who knew the client and the community could often provide the service more quickly and efficiently.

---

[1] See APPENDIX I.

Daycare for children was requested on a one page form[1] which was mailed to the local affiliate of the State Office of Child Development. Sometimes the request was to locate a suitable sitter or center but sometimes it merely requested billing. Payment was made at the end of each month, which meant that the client's sitter had to agree to wait that long. If she was a low-income person herself, the wait could be a handicap. Furthermore, especially in the early months of the program, payment ran weeks behind schedule. Coaches spent a great deal of time investigating complaints from the sitters about lack of payment.

Turnover in staff also afflicted local affiliates of the State Office of Child Development; in Burlington in twenty-four months there were three complete staff changes. Each new staff struggled to come to grips with the backlog of bills and with the everchanging guidelines for approval of sitters and centers. Jan P. was a victim of this confusion. The center where her children were placed was approved for E&D funds but not Title IV-A funds. After she found an approved (and more expensive) sitter, the committee decided she wasn't eligible for Title IV-A funds anyway.

Clearly, the quality of service delivery depends on a multitude of factors, many of them beyond a Counselor's control. Some Counselors felt it would help the client and lessen the frustration if they were not bound by agreements in selecting services. The Counselor should not have to present Special Work as a package of benefits and then see how it fits the client. Rather the emphasis should be on meeting the client's needs as they emerge with the best resources available.

The Coach was useful by virtue of the very availability and flexibility advocated. He was at hand, in daily contact with the Counselor, often the first to sense a client's need and respond to it. Coaches tend to see themselves as client advocates, and indeed may be chosen from the client group. As a consequence they tend to be willing to take risks and "fight the system" in a client's behalf and this is a great aid to getting things accomplished.

F. Counselor-Client Relationships

An employment Counselor sees a client because the client has been unable, for whatever reasons, to solve the problems of getting and keeping a job. The Counselor brings his own training and experience into the relationship, some tools for assessment, some resources for services and placement, and presumably a desire to be helpful Counselors feel, as part of their roles, that they should be interested in people and they try to treat clients as individuals with some degree of sympathy.

---

[1] See APPENDIX H.

Counselors agree that the goal of their efforts is permanent employment for the client. They vary in their emphasis on aspects of their job according to their interests. One may stress reducing dependence on Welfare, another may see his work in the social sense of helping the poor, a third may be interested in the psychological development of his clients. But these angles are all usually constructive and lead to the same goal for the client, employment.

The Counselor is trained to assess a client, discuss his problems, and then work out with him an "employability plan." This plan consists of a permanent job goal and steps to reach that goal. In Jack H.'s case, for example, many jobs were considered and rejected because they were too dangerous (mechanics), too unmanly (school car driver), or not available (gun repair). The goal of delivery truck driver was hit upon by accident and the step to reach it was a Special Work placement. Alice's original goal of professional social work seemed over ambitious to the Counselor who told Alice so. The stopgap job to build her confidence was a stepping stone to any further progress. Her final goal of general duty nursing evolved during her Special Work placement.

Goals must appeal to the client and must be based on what is possible for the client to achieve in his community. It was the E&D experience that although the majority of clients were sincere in their desire to work, few had any sense of their own potential or any knowledge of the job market. Furthermore, many low-income clients have a defeatist attitude toward achievement. They are confused and depressed by their situations and they feel powerless to change their own lives. So the Counselor's job is to encourage and reassure the client while at the same time guiding him toward a goal that is possible and practical.

Alice accepted stopgap work because she had a middle-class orientation. She could see that the job was a means to an end and she could delay gratification without too much anxiety. Many low-income clients don't have this ability to plan ahead. They focus on the immediate job, on whether it meets their expectations for status and salary, or whether they like the working conditions. This is a reason why Special Work functions best when it can become a permanent job, and an end in itself.

Client progress depends a great deal on psychological readiness and Counselors must struggle to be patient and sensitive to a client's anxieties. They must develop the ability to give constructive criticism at the precise moment when it is most likely to help the client and not discourage him. They must learn to recognize and handle the occasional client who is merely playing games with the system. And finally, Counselors must learn to handle the inevitable disappointments and failures that occur.

Clients fail for many and sometimes complex reasons. Sometimes it is the fault of the employer, sometimes it is caused by the client for an unavoidable reason like illness, and sometimes it is the client's fault for no good excuse. It is sometimes a problem for Counselors to decide if failure is "with good cause" or "without good cause." In Jack's case, for example, his behavior was immature and reprehensible, but it was probably not willful. The behavior patterns that caused him to fail were beyond his control and he felt anxiety and regret about the job loss. Still it was a great frustration to his Counselor, planner, and supervisor, and a real temptation to conclude that he was a "lost cause."

Once a client failed in a Special Work slot, the Counselor had several options: he could try a second Special Work placement, or try some other resource of the Employment Service, or refer the client to another agency, or simply stop working with him. Sometimes, if failure had been caused by the employer, a second Special Work placement worked very well. But if failure resulted from insufficiencies in the client, then another job usually didn't help. Counselors who carried mixed caseloads could continue to work with a client in a WIN component, MDTA or the like. But in Burlington and Morrisville, where the Counselors worked exclusively with E&D clients, an enrollee who failed in a slot tended to drop out of the caseload. It was possible to refer the client to another Counselor or even another agency, but this was easily interpreted as rejection by the client, and probably was.

Counselors vary a great deal in the extent to which they will continue to work with a client despite failures. They must try to distinguish between a client who demonstrates a desperate need for help but won't or can't accept it and one who is really open for change. Ronald K. was an unhappy man with many needs but he was not open to any real help. Alice, on the other hand, knew she needed help and made excellent use of what was available. Sometimes it is hard to judge a client and if the Counselor has nothing to offer and stops seeing him, the client might view himself as rejected. This adds rejection to failure and may only compound the client's problems, so the Counselor himself may feel regret and guilt over this.

It must be clear from the foregoing discussion that counseling is a complex job. It involves a knowledge of Employment Service goals and programs, familiarity with the sources and effectiveness of services in the community, experience with clients, particularly in a low-income status, and considerable paperwork. The extent to which Counselors are prepared for these demands varies.

The Vermont State Employment Service hires Counselors from among those who have a background in teaching or social service and who receive high scores on the State personnel test. (It is a test of general knowledge, not specifically geared to counsel-

ing techniques.) The new Counselor is trained in the history of the Employment Service and its general goals. He is also to use certain records such as the counseling folder, and to formulate employability plans. Then he is sent to a local office to observe other Counselors and to start his own work. Over time, he develops knowledge of the resources in his community. This information is personal and cumulative and really cannot be learned except by experience.

Also left to experience is knowledge of clients and their problems. But the E&D experience was that low-income clients share many of the same problems and attitudes. A Counselor would really benefit from learning beforehand that he would encounter clients who were unrealistic, powerless, alcoholic, even sociopathic, and so on. The implications of these issues should be discussed so that the Counselors could from the beginning shape realistic expectations for themselves.

Counseling raises powerful emotions: hopes, frustrations, disappointments, guilt. It would be valuable if Counselors had the opportunity to share their experiences on a regular basis, not just in the coffee lounges, but in well-planned region wide meetings. Attendance should be voluntary and emphasis should be on problem sharing and problem solving, perhaps case by case. Such meetings could have a tremendous effect on staff morale and staff effectiveness, especially for the younger, less experienced staff.

The Employment Service does encourage Counselors to take available courses in topics relating to their work, and will pay for such courses. This was appreciated by all Counselors, although those in rural areas complained that no courses were available. Especially for them, it would be useful to gather with other ES personnel by district or even state-wide to learn together.

A word about paperwork: no one expects to like it but everyone acknowledges some record keeping is necessary. With a caseload of 60 active enrollees,a Counselor would want to keep notes on his clients even if he wasn't obliged to do so. The problem with paperwork is that no one plans all of it, it just happens. Program planners devise forms for every need but do not keep track of the resulting burden. The appendixes to this monograph comprise much of the E&D paperwork but do not include contracts, timesheets, billing forms and the like. For most Counselors, these forms were in addition to WIN and MDTA paperwork. Several suggested that record keeping would be greatly simplified if all ES programs could at least use the same forms. The more time required by paperwork, the less there is for the more important task of maintaining Counselor-client relationships.

G. Counselor and Colleagues

One Counselor who participated in the E&D program operates on a semi-serious rule of thumb: try to spend as much time talking with each client as talking about him to colleagues. Based on the way staffs were organized and interrelated during the project, it did take a tremendous amount of time to coordinate plans and services for each client. The Counselor worked most closely with the Coach and Manpower Specialist, and also maintained contact, through his Manager, with the E&D Central Office. He was often on the phone with service planners and VR counselors, and occasionally with a great variety of other people.

Most counselors felt that the ES employability "team" consisting of Counselor, Manpower Specialist, and Coach was well constructed and functioned smoothly. Usually the Counselor had initial contact with the client and prepared the employability plan. Then he might introduce the client to the Manpower Specialist, or, more usually, would simply give him an assessment of the client.

The Manpower Specialist's reponsibilities were to develop slots either in groups, or singly for a specific client. He would then write the subcontract and monitor the monthly reimbursement procedures. The Coach often met the client when a placement had been decided upon, and helped with arrangements to start work such as transportation and child care. Usually the Coach performed routine follow-up[1] two weeks after placement, again at three and six months. If a problem emerged during these follow-ups, the Coach might handle it himself or refer it to the Counselor. The Coach was also usually responsible for follow-through[2] contacts 30, 90, and 180 days after placement.

The Counselor was designated the team leader and might suggest changes in the roles assigned to the various members depending on everyone's strengths and interests. For instance, the Counselor might choose to follow-up certain clients himself, or make certain job development contacts. Counselors related to Coaches in very individual ways because Coaches' roles were particularly flexible. All the Counselors appreciated their availability and readiness to act. If a crisis occurred, the Counselor usually determined who would handle it. He or the Coach or both might spend a day or even a week on some client problem. A natural camaraderie usually developed among members of the team because they worked closely together toward a common goal -- employment for the client.

Relationships between local office and Central Office staffs were dominated by a difference in responsibilities and consequent focus. The E&D Central Office Staff consisted of

---

[1] See APPENDIX J.

[2] See APPENDIX K.

an administrator and his assistants and clerks. It was their job to design the structure of the program and then to evaluate the results. They worked out service agreements with other agencies, composed an operations handbook and all paperwork, and directed evaluation procedures. They also retained final right of approval on all subcontracts and all expenditures over $20. Most information and requests from the Central Office were written in memos to local office managers and then passed on to appropriate staff. The Central Office gave initial training and some subsequent information in person.

Central Office personnel tended to emphasize the structure of goals of the program as a whole. For instance, they encouraged each office to fill a slot quota so that they could collect enough client experience to be statistically valid in evaluation. Local personnel who actually operated the program tended to focus on the individual needs of the clients. This difference in focus contains potential for tension between those who plan and those who operate a program. (This was true, incidentally, in Social Welfare and Vocational Rehabilitation which were structured similarly. It may not be true in the agencies of larger states where there is such distance between Planning and Operations that they tend to work independently of each other.) In the E&D program, a key figure in controlling staff conflicts is the local office Manager who is in the middle of the chain of command. If he is skillful, he can help each unit to understand the other's point of view.

Another way to keep communication open is to schedule face to face meetings for the entire project staff in which viewpoints can be aired. In Summer 1972, the E&D Staff held a statewide, two and a half day conference in a congenial setting. Central and some local office personnel from all participating agencies as well as some project evaluators were invited to attend. The substance of the meetings was work-in-progress on the project. The Counselors who attended felt that many good ideas were generated at that conference and that morale was very high. Communication was more open than at any other time during the project period.

Most Counselors felt that relationships with their counterparts in other agencies, particularly Social Welfare, were satisfactory despite some problems. In the smaller communities, where there was one Counselor and one service planner, they had frequent, often daily, phone contact and could keep each other abreast of developments case by case. In Burlington, where there were four planners, keeping in touch was more cumbersome. There was a tendency for one or the other party to lag behind in knowledge of the client's situation. There were several attempts to hold face to face staffings in Burlington, but these meetings were not at the moment being discussed. The telephone remained the most expedient means of communication.

In Morrisville, three agencies tried an experiment in

co-location. The E&D Staffs of the Employment Service, Vocational Rehabilitation and Social Welfare all moved into one building in the hope that physically being together would improve coordination. Cooperation did not occur automatically, however, and the staffs needed leadership in learning to work together. Each agency has its own focus and tends to blame the others for not sharing it. For instance, a service planner, concentrating on a family's need for income, may encourage work for a client whom the employment Counselor does not consider ready. If they can learn to minimize these differences, co-located units should develop the same flexibility and force that the employability team already has.

There is another benefit to co-location. From a client's point of view, it may be very confusing to have contact with so many people in so many different agencies. For example, a client may make the rounds from a payment technician, a Medicaid technician, a food stamp technician and a service planner in Welfare, to a Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor, a child care committee member, an employment Counselor, and a Coach. It is easily possible that not all these people keep in touch with each other and that they may give conflicting advice. It happens easily that one agency will try to give its most difficult cases to some other agency and so relieve their own sense of responsibility. Co-location could be a way to achieve overall planning and continuity of service for each client.

H. Follow-Up, Termination and Follow-Through

Follow-up referred to E&D Staff contacts with a client during his Special Work training. At a minimum, it meant three contacts at two weeks, three months, and six months. The form[1] required by the Central Office was designed to assess the client's adjustment from his own, his supervisor's and a staff member's view. The follow-up could be done by the Coach, Manpower Specialist, or Counselor, depending on local office preference.

The contacts were often made by phone to save time, but there is a real advantage to making personal visits. During a relaxed, face-to-face discussion, some problem may emerge that the client or supervisor might not mention on the phone. Then this problem could be handled before it does damage. For instance, if the Counselor had visited Jack H. during the summer, she might have discovered that he disliked his female supervisor and helped the situation. The danger with personal visits is that clients or supervisor may feel the staff is disrupting work or "checking up," so the visits must be handled tactfully. At its best, follow-up can be a kind of preventive maintenance.

If a client is self-reliant, only the minimum contact is necessary. But if the staff anticipates some problems, they may decide to make more frequent contact. It would be helpful if the

[1]See APPENDIX J.

forms left date of contact open and so up to the staff to decide for each client.

A subsidiary purpose of follow-up is to keep track of the employer's ability to hire the client. Some employers need encouragement to plan for the transition to permanent status. If the employer has some hesitation about the client or some problem with his budget, it is best for the staff to know this early in the subcontract so they can prepare the client for what will happen.

An average subcontract period was six months long but a subcontract could be extended if requested by the employer. Usually the reason for such a request was financial: the employer wanted to hire the client but did not have enough money in his budget at that time. This was an issue with Jack H.'s supervisor, but so was Jack's lack of maturity. A third issue was his need for supplementary income until his wife went to work. So in his case, there were three good reasons to extend his subcontract from nine to an unusual 15 months.

When the client is hired permanently or when he fails and drops out of a slot, he is considered terminated from Special Work. However, in neither case does the staff end contact at this point. For all clients, the staff makes follow-through[1] contact at 30, 90, and 180 days after they terminate from Special Work. In this length of time, clients were also eligible for social services, Training Related Expense money, and Enrichment funds. Counselors appreciated this feature of the program as it helped to ease the transition from Special Work to whatever the client did next.

If a client entered an unsubsidized job and stayed on it for six months, he was counted as a statistical success for the program. This period may have been too short to judge, though, for a number of clients managed to survive six months and then failed later. Sometimes the job fell through, as in Jan P.'s case.

Sometimes, however, it was the client who failed once he lost agency support. An example of this occurred in Burlington with a client named Ned G. Ned was a 35 year old handicapped veteran with a sixth grade education and very limited intelligence. His only successful work had been several security guard jobs interspersed with long periods of unemployment. Ned had a small Welfare grant to support himself and a young son. He lived with a woman who had a separate grant covering several other children. Over the years, Ned had participated in several programs to employ low income clients.

A slot as watchman was developed for Ned at a military

---

[1] See APPENDIX K.

installation and the staff assisted him in meeting requirements for the job: he needed compulsory car insurance and a new driver's license to drive on the job. He also needed a loan for a personal car as public transportation didn't operate at night. Once he started work, he did well on the job and toward the end of six months, the supervisor agreed to waive an eighth grade education requirement and hire him. At the last minute, funds were threatened, but Ned's job was saved by the intervention of the Employment Service Veteran's Representative.

Just at the transition to permanent employment, Ned's "wife" suffered a recurrence of a neurosis that made her afraid to stay home alone at night. The E&D Staff explored a number of solutions to this problem but finally paid a niece with TRE funds to stay with the woman for several weeks until she felt better. Ned worked well through the six month follow-through and was declared a success. The Staff congratulated itself on helping a difficult client and filed his case. Six months later, they learned by accident that Ned's "wife" had gotten sick again and that Ned had missed three weeks work and then lost his job.

Ned is an example of the kind of chronic dependent client who will never cope very well on his own with the task of getting and keeping a job. But he likes to work and he has proven that he can work and contribute to society if he has some support. Perhaps such clients need to be followed through on a permanent basis.

A similar need is evident for some clients, particularly men with large families, who do their best and still cannot earn enough to support their families. These "working poor" do not need service so much as permanent financial assistance. It may be in indirect form, such as free day care, public housing, Medicaid and food stamps. Or it may be direct payments, although this form may tend to foster dependence and carry the onus of Welfare. Whatever form financial support takes, it should be consistent. Too often benefits are offered and then policy changes, funds are cut, and benefits withdrawn. This only reinforces the feeling of the low-income person that life is beyond his control.

As long as unemployment levels remain high, the handicapped, the marginal, the poor worker will find it terribly hard to get and keep a job. Under this circumstance, it may be vain for a program like Special Work to limit itself to the hard-to-employ. Perhaps it would be better to make some hard decisions about choice of clients and to concentrate on those who have the greatest potential to succeed and support their families fully. From the Counselor's point of view, subsidized employment is a valuable resource in helping those who lack confidence and experience to get a foothold in the labor market. It is a resource that they would like to have permanently.

SECTION IV

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

The following recommendations are based on the experiences of five Counselors in the Vermont E&D program in Vermont over several years. They do not constitute an exhaustive review of the program and its structure, but rather they reiterate some points about which the Counselors feel most strongly. The recommendations, divided into Goals, Operating Features, and The Counselor's Role, are intended to maximize the effectiveness of any public service employment program.

GOALS OF THE PROGRAM

1. Emphasis should be placed on choosing clients who are most likely to benefit from participation.

2. Emphasis should be placed on Special Work slots which can result in permanent unsubsidized employment. However, there is some value to using a slot for training or evaluation and Counselors like to retain this flexibility of use.

3. The most effective slots are those chosen for a specific client, whether in an individual subcontract or from a slot pool. The least effective are those which an employer seeks himself.

4. For a few chronic dependent clients, some form of permanent subsidized employment should be considered.

FEATURES OF THE PROGRAM

1. Counselors should be able to choose services which best suit a client's need and should not be limited by agreements between agencies.

2. Coordination of services might be simplified if many agencies were co-located. However, leadership must be provided to insure smooth cooperation.

3. Training Related Expense money for car repairs is very valuable.

4. Local offices would like discretion to spend up to $100 in TRE or Enrichment Funds.

5. A small petty cash fund would be very useful to local offices.

6. Local office personnel should have some State credentials for use in charging items for clients.

7. Frequency of follow-up should be decided by Counselor and staff on a client by client basis.

THE COUNSELOR'S ROLE

1. New counselors need training which deals with the problems of low-income clients. Also, periodic inservice meetings on a voluntary basis would help counselors improve the quality of their work.

2. Counselors should be given mixed caseloads so that Special Work is one of many resources available in working with clients.

3. Simplify paperwork. Where possible, forms that have been developed for other programs should be used.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

BASIC INFORMATION REQUIRED TO IDENTIFY POTENTIAL REFERRALS TO THE "EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION MANPOWER PILOT PROJECT."

I. A potential referral MUST appear to be "E&D-eligible" under the legislation presently proposed in the Congress, known as H.R. 1 or the Mills Bill. The figures in the chart below are derived from our understanding of the bill.

A Working Definition of "E&D-eligible."

An "E&D-eligible" person is any member of a low-income family with children. To determine the maximum allowable income of a family which may be "E&D-eligible"--

1. Count $800 for each of the first two family members;
2. Add $400 for each of the next three family members;
3. Add $300 for each of the next two family members;
4. Add $200 for the next family member (maximum).
5. Divide the result of steps 1 through 4 by two, and
6. Add this to the result of 1 through 4, then
7. Add $720 to the result of step 6.

It is not necessary to use this formula to determine a family's eligibility, since the chart below shows the eligibility. This formula is given as information in order to show how the maximum for eligibility is derived, based on family size and income.

FAMILY SIZE	MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE INCOME	
	Special Work	Upgrading
2 --(2 X $800) + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $720	$3120	$3774
3 -- (2 X $800 + 1 X $400) + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $720	3720	4464
4 -- (2 X $800 + 2 X $400) + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $720	4320	5134
5 -- (2 X $800 + 3 X $400) + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $720	4920	5904
6 -- (2 X $800 + 3 X $400 + 1 X $300) + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $720	5370	6444
7 -- (2 X $800 + 3 X $400 + 2 X $300) + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $720	5820	6934
8 -- (2 X $800 + 3 X $400 + 1 X $200) + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $720	6120	7344
Maximum Allowance		

For the purposes of this very basic eligibility determination, "income" may be considered as income from any and all sources except Welfare payments of any type. Please note that to be "E&D-eligible," a person must be a member of a low-income family with children; childless couples or unattached (single) adults are not "E&D-eligible."

Maximum allowable income levels for families of various sizes

are determined by adding family income from all sources except Welfare benefits for the immediately preceding quarter (3 months) previous to the initial interview with the prospective trainee, and annualizing this amount.

II. A potential referral to the "E&D Manpower Pilot Project" should appear to be a person who might benefit from either "Special Work" or "Upgrading."

A. SPECIAL WORK

Enrollee Requirements

Enrollees considered for Special Work Projects shall be:

-Those having no recent work experience (may have rusty work skills that need brushing up).

-Those previously employed but not able to retain employment because of poor work attitudes and habits.

-Those now seasonally unemployed or temporarily unemployed because of the general economic downturn.

-Those in holding status awaiting MDTA or WIN skill training slots currently filled.

It must be kept in mind that this is an Experimental and Demonstration project and can not become "locked in" to a single approach to a problem, but must remain flexible in its administration.

The E&D "Special Work Project" is designed to provide work experience slots in private or public non-profit organizations for individuals who for a variety of reasons are not able to compete on the open labor market, or successfully engage in a skill training program due to such conditions as lack of motivation, poor personal appearance, inability to relate well to supervision or co-workers, limited opportunities having been made available to the person in the past, poor work habits, personal attitudes not acceptable to employers, and minor mental or physical handicaps which might be overcome or alleviated through a closely supervised work experience situation.

"Service to the individual" is the reason for being in business, and the "Special Work Project" is a unique training device to serve any E&D-eligible who is at present considered unemployable for the various reasons mentioned above.

In terms of training, what will a "Special Work Project" offer? First, there is a recognition of the importance of interpersonal relations and human relations training. Secondly, the instilling of good work habits and punctuality must not be underestimated.

A "Special Work Project" is a "work experience" situation as differentiated from a "skill training" situation. However, we attempt to "build-in" some basic skill training in each Special Work Slot. The basic purpose of a "Special Work Project" is to assist a person to reach a level where he is able to profit from pure skill training or is able to secure a job with a private employer, or to provide temporary, subsidized employment for persons who are completely unable, through no fault of their own, to find employment in the local, competitive labor market.

It is felt that an E&D client should not be in "Special Work Project" training more than six months. However, if properly justified, a client could remain in this training longer. Intensive and close follow-ups in "Special Work" are extremely important. In this respect, it is very difficult to determine at what point an E&D client in "Special Work" will become job ready or OJT training-ready material. It is expected that the E&D Project will render many answers in this regard.

It is anticipated that many of the E&D clients in "Special Work" will require massive supportive services similar to those currently provided in the Work Incentive Program. These services, such as health, interpersonal and human relations, education, vocational rehabilitation, counseling, transportation, childcare, and other aids will be concurrent with the training.

B. UPGRADING

PLEASE NOTE:

Upgrading training to be carried on under this experimental project is a restricted type of effort as outlined below and is therefore not viewed as a training resource for agencies at the present time. Initially, E&D Manpower Pilot Project Staff will be identifying Upgrading trainees by locating specific employers who presently employ E&D-eligible persons in a specific work situation that evidences potential for Upgrading. Therefore, Upgrading trainees will be located through employers rather than by referral from cooperating agencies. The information provided below is presented for familiarization purposes only.

For the purposes of this document, "Upgrading" shall be defined as a short-term, limited duration, high impact, high intensity process and procedure for elevating a worker from a low occupational level to a higher occupational level having a different title or greater skill requirements and commanding a higher rate of pay.

Upgrading Training has the following characteristics:

(1) Considers the low-skill worker and his work and home environment.

(2) Helps "unfreeze" negative attitudes and alter traditional behavior that management, supervisors,

and the low-skill workers may exhibit toward each other.

(3) Reduces traditionally lengthy curricula into short, high-impact courses.

(4) Builds self-esteem, confidence and motivation necessary to enable the worker to go beyond the job for which he is being trained.

(5) Utilizes techniques in developing work-group cohesiveness and motivating the low-skill, low-wage minority group worker to assume new social and occupational responsibilities.

(6) Employs curricula developed specifically for the particular job and manpower needs of the individual organization.

APPENDIX B

VSES: RESUME OF APPLICANT HISTORY

VSES-400
SM 2-70

State of Vermont
Department of Employment Security
Montpelier

Resume of Applicant History

IDENTIFICATION

1. Name of Applicant (Last, first, middle initial)	2. Social Security No.	3. Date of Referral

4. Home Address (include county)	5. Name and Address of Referral Agency
Telephone No.	Telephone No.

6. Height	7. Weight	8. Date of Birth	9. Name and Address of Nearest Relative (not living with applicant)

10. Place of Birth

11. U.S. Citizen or Permanent Resident
☐ Yes ☐ No

12. Sex
☐ Male ☐ Female

13. Race

Telephone No.

14. Minority Membership
☐ Negro ☐ Am. Indian ☐ Mex. Am. ☐ P. R. ☐ Other
(Specify)

15. Resides in Public Housing	16. English Language	17. Handicapped
☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No

18. Draft Classification	19. Veterans Status	20. Length of Time on Welfare
		Years Months

21. Marital Status
☐ Single ☐ Married ☐ Widowed ☐ Separated Divorced

22. **FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS**

A. No of Persons	B. Head of Household is	C. (For Youth Only)
1. Living in Household 2. In Family	1. Father ☐ 2. Mother ☐ 3. Applicant ☐ 4. Spouse ☐ 5. Female Guardian ☐ 6. Male Guardian ☐ 7. Son ☐ 8. Daughter ☐ 9. Other ☐ (Specify)	Applicant Lives with 1. Both parents ☐ 2. Father only ☐ 3. Mother only ☐ 4. Guardian ☐ 5. Other ☐ (Specify)

D. No. of Dependents	E. Language spoken in household	F. Usual occupations of family members
Under 6 years 6 to 15 years 16 to 21 years 22 to 65 years Over 65 years	1. English ☐ 2. Spanish ☐ 3. Other ☐ (Specify)	1. Father 2. Mother 3. Spouse 4. Son 5. Daughter (For youth only)

G. During last week, head of household
- Worked 35 hours or more ☐
- Worked less than 35 hours ☐
- Was not working ☐

H. Other household members employed 35 hours or more per week
- 1. Father ☐ 2. Mother ☐
- 3. Brothers ☐ 4. Sons ☐
- Sisters ☐ Daughters ☐
- 5. Other ☐

(Specify)

I. (For youth only) Contributes to support of family
- 1 Yes ☐
- 2. No ☐

J. Amount of welfare cash assistance

K. Estimated Annual Family Income (from all sources)
- Below 1,000 ☐
- From 1,000 to 2,000 ☐
- From 2,000 to 3,000 ☐
- From 3,000 to 4,000 ☐
- From 4,000 to 5,000 ☐
- Above 5,000 ☐

L. Comments

23. HEALTH

A. Date of last medical examination

B. Content of physical examination (if obtained less than 1 year ago). (Check box if included)
- 1. Chest X-Ray ☐
- 2. Urinalysis ☐
- 3. Serology for Syphilis ☐
- 4. Electrocardiogram ☐
- 5. Hematocrit ☐
- 6. Pap smear ☐
- 7. Other ☐

(Specify)

C. Name and address of Examining Physician

D. Results of examination

E. Other physical or mental examinations obtained:	Date Obtained	Name & Address of Examining Physician	Results
Eye ☐ Hearing ☐ Other ☐ (Specify)			

F. Corrective treatment obtained or being obtained (include date)

G. Corrective treatment which needs to be obtained

H. Physical/Medical conditions which would or may restrict work activity

I. Comments:

24. **ACADEMIC**

A. Highest School Grade Completed	B. Ever Left School Before Graduating ☐ Yes ☐ No	C. No. of years/months since leaving school Years ..... Months .....
D. Reasons for leaving school Academic ☐ Discipline ☐ Graduation ☐ Economic ☐ Health ☐ Other ☐ ..... (Specify)		E. Major subjects areas

F. If presently attending academic classes
1. Name & Location of Educational Facility.....
2. Degree being sought .....
3. Dates and hours of attendance .....

G. Federal Program Participation ☐ Yes ☐ No.

H. Comments:

25. VOCATIONAL TRAINING

A. NAME OF COURSE	TYPE OF TRAINING FACILITY	LENGTH OF COURSE	COURSE COMPLETED YES	COURSE COMPLETED NO	DATE TERMINATED FROM COURSE

B. If course not completed, give reasons.

C. Comments:

26. WORK EXPERIENCE

A. Has Applicant Held a Job for which he received wages Yes ☐ No ☐ If "no" skip to L	B. Is he currently working Yes ☐ No ☐	C. Hours worked per week on current or last job
D. Earnings per hour on current or last job	E. Ever held a job of 30 days or more Yes ☐ No ☐ If "no" skip to L	F. No. of weeks since last job held 30 days or more

G. OCCUPATION(S) OF JOBS LASTING 30 DAYS OR MORE	APPROX LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT	DATE LAST EMPLOYED	NAME OF EMPLOYER	REASON FOR TERMINATION

H. Primary Occupation (Title & DOT Code)	I. Consecutive Weeks Unemployed
J. Unemployment Insurance Claimant ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Exhausted	K. Estimated Annual Personal Income

L. Leisure time activities (hobbies, etc.)

M. Comments

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

APPENDIX C

VSES COUNSELING RECORD

COUNSELING RECORD

SSA No. _____ DOT Code _____

Street _____ City _____

Tel. _____ Birth Date _____ Sex _____ Handicapped ☐ Veteran ☐

Height _____ Weight _____ Car ☐ License ☐ VRD Ref. ☐

Referred by _____ Counselor _____

Goal _____ Plan: Job Ref. ☐ Job Dev. ☐ Prevoc./B. Ed. ☐

MDTA Training: Referred _____ Enrolled _____ Other: _____

Education and Training:

Work Experience:

GATB _____ Culture Fair _____ NATB _____

Date Date Date

Results of ICL:

Prof. Tests _____ SATB No. _____

Date Date

Scores

Date Closed Reason: ☐ Pl. Acc. to Plan ☐ Lost Contact ☐ Left Area

☐ Found Own Job ☐ Not Responsive ☐ Other (explain)

☐ Satisfactory Adj. to Counseling

ES-614
11-71

Socio-economic Data _____

Physical or Mental Limitations _____

Personal Traits _____

Counselor's Comments _____

Dates of Counsel Inter.	Problem: _____

Dates of Counsel. Inter.

Plan:

CONTINUATION SPACE

FOLLOW UP:

DATE	RESULT	DATE	RESULT

APPENDIX D

(12-70)

FAP-VR SUPPORT SERVICES
REFERRAL AND SERVICE REPORT

Referral Date to be Completed by FAP-E&D Office

Name_____ Soc. Sec. No._____

Address_____ Zip Code_____

D.O.B._____ Sex_____ Phone No._____

(Check one) Minor Medical Service_____ Determination_____

Pertinent Information_____

_____

_____

Date of Referral_____ **Referred by**_____

To Be Completed by VRD

Date of Referral_____ Case No._____

MMS Completed_____ Determination Completed_____ Referred to VR_____

Action or Determination

Date_____ **Counselor**_____ Review Physician_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E

1. Aptitudes Measured by the GATB

The nine aptitudes measured by the GATB, are listed below. The letter used as the symbol to identify each aptitude and the part or parts of the GATB measuring each aptitude are also shown

Aptitude	Tests
G—Intelligence	Part 3—Three-Dimensional Space Part 4—Vocabulary Part 6—Arithmetic Reason
V—Verbal Aptitude	Part 4—Vocabulary
N—Numerical Aptitude	Part 2—Computation Part 6—Arithmetic Reason
S—Spatial Aptitude	Part 3—Three-Dimensional Space
P—Form Perception	Part 5—Tool Matching Part 7—Form Matching
Q—Clerical Perception	Part 1—Name Comparing
K—Motor Coordination	Part 8—Mark Making
F—Finger Dexterity	Part 11—Assemble Part 12—Disassemble
M—Manual Dexterity	Part 9—Place Part 10—Turn

The following are the definitions of the nine aptitudes measured by the GATB

G—**Intelligence.**—General learning ability. The ability to "catch on" or understand instructions and underlying principles; the ability to reason and make judgments. Closely related to doing well in school. Measured by Parts 3, 4, and 6.

V—**Verbal Aptitude.**—The ability to understand meaning of words and to use them effectively. The ability to comprehend language, to understand relationships between words and to understand meanings of whole sentences and paragraphs. Measured by Part 4.

N—**Numerical Aptitude.**—Ability to perform arithmetic operations quickly and accurately. Measured by Parts 2 and 6.

S—**Spatial Aptitude.**—Ability to think visually of geometric forms and to comprehend the two-dimensional representation of three-dimensional objects. The ability to recognize the relationships resulting from the movement of objects in space. Measured by Part 3.

P—**Form Perception.**—Ability to perceive pertinent detail in objects or in pictorial or graphic material. Ability to make visual comparisons and discriminations and see slight differences in shapes and shadings of figures and widths and lengths of lines. Measured by Parts 5 and 7.

Q—**Clerical Perception.**—Ability to perceive pertinent detail in verbal or tabular material. Ability to observe differences in copy, to proofread words and numbers, and to avoid perceptual errors in arithmetic computation. A measure of speed of perception which is required in many industrial jobs even when the job does not have verbal or numerical content. Measured by Part 1.

K—**Motor Coordination.**—Ability to coordinate eyes and hands or fingers rapidly and accurately in making precise movements with speed. Ability to make a movement response accurately and swiftly. Measured by Part 8.

F—**Finger Dexterity.**—Ability to move the fingers, and manipulate small objects with the fingers, rapidly or accurately. Measured by Parts 11 and 12.

M—**Manual Dexterity.**—Ability to move the hands easily and skillfully. Ability to work with the hands in placing and turning motions. Measured by Parts 9 and 10.

APPENDIX F

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF ENRICHMENT TRAINING

FROM: Local Office Unit: _____ DATE: _____

TO: _____, E.S. Director

_____

The Enrichment Training proposed below has a direct relationship to the Employability Plan drawn up for the E&D Special Work trainee. The following narrative is submitted as substantiation of the proposed Enrichment Training as an essential part of the trainee's Employability Plan: (Please specify type of training requested and the reason for the training)

Manager's Signature: _____

_____

NAME OF TRAINEE: _____

NAME OF SUBCONTRACTOR AND SUBCONTRACT NUMBER: _____

_____

NAME OF INDIVIDUAL REPRESENTING
TRAINING FACILITY: _____

BEGINNING DATE: _____ ENDING DATE: _____

HRS. PER WEEK: _____ TOTAL NO. OF HOURS: _____

COST OF TRAINING

-Cost of Course _____
-Registration Fee _____
-Textbooks _____
-Other _____
TOTAL COST $ _____

THE STATEMENT BELOW IS TO BE COMPLETED BY CENTRAL OFFICE ONLY

The above request for the expenditure of Enrichment Training funds in the amount of $_____ is approved/disapproved

DATE _____ SIGNED _____
Director, Employment Service

-original & 2 copies to central office
1 copy for local office file

APPENDIX G

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF TRAINING
RELATED EXPENSES

FROM: Local Office Unit, _____ DATE _____
Location

TO: Central Office, Montpelier

E.S. LOCAL OFFICE MANAGER: Check and sign your name after the appropriate statement below.

The following items and/or services costing less than $19.99 have been purchased as essential training related needs for the trainee(s) listed below. An itemized bill for each trainee is attached hereto. _____
Manager's Signature

The following items and/or services costing more than $19.99 are recommended as essential training related needs for the trainee (s) listed below. I shall await Central Office approval before purchasing them. _____
Manager's Signature

Because of a very urgent need, the following items and/or services costing less than $19.99 have been purchased and paid for as essential training related needs by _____
Name
_____, who will claim reimburse-
Title
ment on Form DA-F-6A "Expense Account" submittal. Form TRE-E&D is submitted to record this transaction for statistical purposes.

_____
Manager's Signature

TRAINEE'S NAME	DESCRIPTION AND QUANTITY OF ITEM(S)	COST PER ITEM(S)	TOTAL COST

_____ _____ $_____
SUBCONTRACTOR SUBCONTRACT NUMBER GRAND TOTAL

JUSTIFICATION OF NEED FOR PURCHASES(S) _____

_____

_____

ATTACHMENTS (Bills, Estimates; must bear Local Office Manager's signature to show his approval. _____

_____

Distribution: (a) Original and two copies of this form to the D.E.S. Central Office, "attention E&D"

(b) One copy for Local Office File.

THE STATEMENT BELOW IS TO BE COMPLETED BY CENTRAL OFFICE ONLY

The above request for expenditure of training related funds in the amount of _____ is approved/disapproved. If
Cross out inappropriate word
approved, please make purchase described above and return this form with the bill as described in the distribution above.

Date _____ Signed, Director, Employment Service _____

APPENDIX H

Revised 1-11-72
OCD - 14

CHILD CARE SERVICES

CHILD CARE INFORMATION & REFERRAL FORM

DATE OF INFORMATION: _____ Date Received _____

DISTRIBUTION (of copies):
Regional 4-C
Social Services Unit in
Burlington or Morrisville
E&D Applicant file

Date Used for Placement of Children in Care _____

NAME OF WIN, E&D, VR or Other COUNSELOR INITIATING FORM: _____
(Circle one which applies) or specify other.

Change in Placement? ☐ If yes, check here.

(Date Used) _____

" " _____

_____

Tel. No. _____

---

1. Name of applicant (last, first, middle initial)

2. Home address (include county)

Tel. No.

3. Applicant's means of transportation:

☐ Own vehicle ☐ Other (specify)

4. Is spouse at home to care for children to enable applicant to work?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Project status of applicant (check those blocks applicable):

☐ WIN E&D Project
☐ Training start date
☐ Training unscheduled

☐ VR Project/Other _____
☐ Day care needed by ___
☐ Treatment or training unscheduled

☐ Check here if applicant on ANFC

---

6. Children requiring care to enable applicant to work: (If #4 is yes, give only name and ages of all children under 15. If no, complete all sections.)

Full Name	Age (Yrs/Mos)	Toilet Trained?	Talks?	Special problems: Speech defect, handicap, mental or physical health, etc.	Need a/

a/ Coding of needs
A Full-time care/Preschool
B Part-time care/Preschool
C School age care before & after

APPENDIX I

VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Part A - Service Need Record of Request

1) TO: _____ 2) DATE: _____

3) FROM: _____ 4) TEL. NO: _____

5) TRAINEE: _____

6) SUBJECT: _____

7) COMMENTS:

Part B - Service Delivery Record

8) TO: _____ 9) DATE SERVICE INITIATED: _____

10) FROM: _____ 11) TEL. NO. _____

12) COMMENTS:

13) ADDITIONAL SERVICE OR REFERRAL (Other than requested)

13) ESTIMATED COST (or time) 14) DATE SERVICE COMPLETED: _____

a) Requested Service _____ 15) PAID BY:

b) Additional Service _____ a) _____

b) _____

Form E&D-SERREQ

IN-TRAINING FOLLOW-UP FOR SPECIAL WORK ENROLLEES

THIS FORM IS TO BE COMPLETED BY A COACH OR MANPOWER SPECIALIST 2 WEEKS AFTER A SW CLIENT HAS BEGUN TRAINING; THEREAFTER AT 3 MONTHS AND 6 MONTHS. AFTER EACH VISIT, A COPY OF THE IN-TRAINING FOLLOW-UP FORM IS TO BE SENT TO THE E&D CENTRAL UNIT, AND A RECORD IS TO BE KEPT AT THE LOCAL OFFICE OF EACH VISIT.

NAME OF CLIENT:

NAME OF SUBCONTRACTOR:

JOB TITLE:

SUBCONTRACT NO.:

DOT CODE:

NAME OF SUPERVISOR:

NAME OF COACH (OR MANPOWER SPECIALIST):

DATE OF VISIT (WRITE IN APPROPRIATE BOX):

END OF 1st 2 WEEKS	END OF 3 MONTHS	END OF 6 MONTHS

I. SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW (DISCUSS WITH THE WORKSITE SUPERVISOR QUESTIONS SUCH AS THE FOLLOWING):

a.) SUPERVISOR'S ASSESSMENT OF CLIENT'S PROGRESS IN TERMS OF PUNCTUALITY ATTENDANCE, RELATIONSHIPS ON THE JOB, MOTIVATION, QUALITY OF WORK, ATTITUDE AND SELF-CONFIDENCE

b.) SUPERVISOR'S PERCEPTION OF CLIENT'S PROBLEMS, IF ANY

II. CLIENT INTERVIEW (DISCUSS WITH CLIENT THE FOLLOWING):

a.) CLIENT'S SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH JOB AND TRAINING

b.) DOES CLIENT HAVE SERVICE NEEDS OR PROBLEMS WITH WHICH E&D CAN ASSIST? WHAT?

c. WHAT SUPPORT SERVICES IS CLIENT PRESENTLY RECEIVING?

d. WHAT IS THE TYPE AND AMOUNT OF WELFARE BENEFITS CLIENT IS RECEIVING AT THIS TIME?

III. E&D COMMENTS

a.) HAVE ANY PLANS BEEN MADE TO RESOLVE CLIENT'S PROBLEMS OR SERVICE NEEDS? WHAT ARE THEY?

b.) WHAT IS COACH'S OR MANPOWER SPECIALIST'S ASSESSMENT OF CLIENT'S PROGRESS, HIS JOB SATISFACTION?

USE OTHER SIDE FOR FURTHER COMMENTS

Vt. DES

ES-905
2.5M 6-72

APPENDIX K

POST-TRAINING FOLLOW-THROUGH FOR SWP CLIENTS

POST-TRAINING FOLLOW-THROUGH FOR SWP CLIENTS

When a SW enrollee leaves the program (either terminates or completes), an E&D STAT form reporting the client's termination is sent to the central E&D unit. If the client was placed in permanent employment, this information is recorded on the STAT form. Thereafter 30, 90 and 180 day follow-through contacts from the date of termination are to be made on **all** project leavers. A copy of the follow-through form for each visit is to be sent to the central E&D unit. It is the responsibility of the local E&D staff to maintain a "tickler" file noting when each contact is to be made.

CHECK BOX: ☐ ☐ ☐ Day Follow-Through
30 90 180

DATE OF CONTACT:
NAME OF STAFF MEMBER:

NAME OF CLIENT:

ADDRESS:

TELEPHONE NO:

DATE TERMINATED FROM SWP:

CLIENT ACTIVITY AT THIS TIME:
☐ —unemployed, not in labor force
☐ —unemployed, looking for work
☐ —employed with SWP employer
☐ —employed with other employer
☐ —in other training
—name of training program
—type of job for which training is being given

I. CLIENT INFORMATION

A. Amount and type of welfare client is presently receiving:

B. Support services client is presently receiving:

C. If client is presently unemployed, what are reasons:

D. If client has left previous job, what was reason for leaving:

E. If client is presently employed:

Name of employer:

Date client began job:

Client's job title:

Employer SIC:

Hourly wage rate

Client's DOT:

Hours worked per week:

	YES	NO
Is client satisfied with wages	☐	☐
Is client satisfied with job duties	☐	☐
Is client satisfied with supervisor	☐	☐
Is client satisfied with job location	☐	☐

F. Does client have any problems, or service needs for which E&D can help? What?

VI. DES

(CONTINUED ON REVERSE SIDE)

ES-807
2.EM 6-72

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mattson, Robert. Final Upgrading Report of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project. Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1973.

"Study of the Vermont Manpower Experimental and Demonstration Project," a report prepared by Booz-Allen Public Administration Services, Inc., Washington, D. C. for the Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1973.